DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 927 UD 025 677

TITLE High School Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (A.I./D.P.) Program, 1985-1986. End of Year Report. OEA Evaluation Report.

INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn. Office of Educational Assessment.

PUB DATE Jan 87

NOTE 92p.; Prepared by the OEA High School Evaluation Unit. For the previous year's report, see ED 271 529.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Attendance; *Dropout Characteristics; *Dropout Prevention; Educationally Disadvantaged; *High Risk Students; *High Schools; Program Content; School Counseling; *School Holding Power; Tutorial Programs; Urban Schools

IDENTIFIERS *Dropout Prevention Program; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

The 1985-86 Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (AIDP) program aimed at improving student attendance and achievement, reducing the dropout rate, and increasing the number of students completing school. The program, which began in 1984-85, operated in selected middle, high, and special education schools and programs having large numbers of students with excessive absences. Principals could choose one of three models for implementing the six program components. This final report examines the 1985-86 AIDP program as it operated in 26 selected New York City public high schools. It presents the characteristics of the schools and students in the program; describes program implementation; analyzes attendance, courses passed, and promotion rates for the student participants; and presents conclusions and recommendation. Three appendices provide additional information on data collection procedures and school-by-school program implementations. The program consisted of the following six components: (1) facilitating services to students; (2) attendance outreach; (3) guidance and counseling services; (4) health services; (5) school level linkages; and (6) alternative educational programs. Findings show that AIDP program objectives were not met by all students. Reasons for those differences are discussed. Recommendations are made for improving the program. (PS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285927

HIGH SCHOOL
ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT/
DROPOUT PREVENTION
(A.I./D.P.) PROGRAM
1985 - 1986
END OF YEAR REPORT

OEA Evaluation Report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard Guttenberg
NYC Bd. of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Evaluation Section Report
Robert Tobias, Administrator
John E. Schoener, Senior Manager

January, 1987

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT/ DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I./D.P.) PROGRAM 1985 - 1986 END OF YEAR REPORT

Prepared by the O.E.A.
High School Evaluation Unit

Dolores M. Mei
Evaluation Manager

James T. Langlois
Evaluation Associate

Carol J. Meyer
Jan L. Rosenblum
Evaluation Consultants

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

It is the policy of the Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, creed, national origin, age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex, in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact: Carole Guerra, Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator, Office of Educational Assessment, 110 Livingston Street, Room 743, Brooklyn, New York 11201. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to: Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York; or the Director, Office of Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IMPROVEMENT/DROPOUT PREVENTION (A.I./D.P.) PROGRAM
1985 - 1986

EVALUATION SUMMARY

This final report examines the 1985-86 Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (A.I./D.P.) program as it operated in 26 selected New York City public high schools. It presents the characteristics of the schools and students in the program; describes program implementation; analyzes attendance, courses passed, and promotion rates for the student participants; and presents conclusions and recommendations. Data were obtained from student rosters distributed to each of the 26 schools in October, 1985, February, 1986, and June, 1986; interviews with central program administrators, school principals, and A.I./D.P. staff members; student questionnaires; and observations of selected program activities.

The 1985-86 A.I./D.P. program was competently managed and implemented at all program sites. With few exceptions, the mandated number of students to be served was met or substantially exceeded; furthermore, only a small percentage of those served failed to meet the eligibility criteria stipulated in program guidelines. The attendance outreach and guidance and counseling services provided to all A.I./D.P. students were found to be particularly effective in serving the needs of these at-risk students.

Although A.I./D.P. students as a whole did not meet program objectives, some groups of program students consistently did. One such group was those students served by the program the entire year, suggesting that program effectiveness is closely related to the length of the treatment received. Students in Project SOAR, one of three program models, also consistently met program objectives. These results may be attributed both to the intensive remediation and supportive services provided to small groups of block-programmed students, and to the fact that SOAR students generally were younger and less "hard-core" than students in other program models.

Full-service students also generally performed better than students who received supportive services only. During the fall, 1985 term, 46 percent of the full-services students had better attendance and 55 percent passed more courses than they did during fall, 1984, as compared to 40 percent and 34 percent of the supportive-services-only students, respectively. Results during the spring term were similar. These results suggest that alternative and remedial educational services in conjunction with supportive services had a significant positive impact on students' attendance and achievement.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

As specified in program guidelines, participation in the A.I./D.P. program was limited to those schools with an attendance rate below the citywide median of 87 percent. Other factors considered by the Division of High Schools in selecting schools to receive A.I./D.P. funds were each school's dropout rate and the need to ensure that students throughout the city received program services. Each selected school was expected to serve special education students in proportion to their representation in the

borough. In general, students who were absent for 20 days during the previous term or 40 days during the previous year were eligible for the program.

Participating schools were permitted to select one of three models in which to implement program components. Sixteen schools selected the Project SOAR model, a fully-designed program of instructional, tutorial, and enrichment activities; seven chose implementation methods from a menu of strategies; and three utilized the Operation Success (O.S.) model, a work-readiness and training program developed by Federation Employment and Guidance Services (FEGS). All schools were to identify 150 students to receive A.I./D.P. program services. In addition, O.S. schools were to provide FEGS services to the number of students specified in a contract between the Board of Education and FEGS.

The total served population for the 1985-86 school year was 5,835. Fifty percent (2,915) participated in Project SOAR, 29 percent (1,704) in Operation Success, and 21 percent (1,216) in strategies schools. Sixty-two percent of the students were ninth-graders and 34 percent were tenth-graders; the majority of ninth-graders were in Project SOAR, while the majority of tenth-graders were served by strategies and O.S. schools. The target population also exhibited the following characteristics: 86 percent of the A.I./D.P. students had been enrolled in a high school the previous year; 85 percent had failed at least three courses in 1984-85; 56 percent were overage for their grade; 47 percent were reading at least two years below grade level; four percent were limited English proficient (LEP); and less than two percent were special education students.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Program Requirements

The Chancellor's guidelines established the minimum requirements for services and set limits on the personnel and resources on which funds could be spent. The basic minimum complement of services included: a facilitation component with a .4 facilitator to administer the program at the school and a Pupil Personnel Committee to coordinate A.I./D.P. with other school-based programs; an attendance component with attendance outreach services and incentives; a guidance component to provide counseling to every targeted student; a health component to provide diagnostic physical screening for all A.I./D.P. students, referrals for appropriate follow-up services, and the monitoring of these referrals; school-level linkages to provide either high school orientation, joint activities between middle and high school students, or transitional guidance services; and alternative education consisting of high-interest programs designed to encourage attendance and improve achievement. The latter component was provided to 100 of the 150 students receiving A.I./D.P. services; these students were designated as full-service students.

Program Management

All six program components were fully and competently implemented at each A.I./D.P. site early in the fall, 1985 term. More than 90 percent of

the SOAR and strategies schools served the mandated number of students (150) during the course of the year, and many served substantially more than that number. All three O.S. sites served at least 20 percent more students than the number specified in their contract. Eighty-eight percent of the students receiving A.I./D.P. services met the program's attendance eligibility criteria.

Aspects of each component were similar across models, except for the alternative educational component. In SOAR schools, full-service students were grouped together into small "families" and provided with a highly structured block program which combined alternative and required educational services. In strategies schools, full-service students received special academic classes plus career guidance services; in some cases, these career services were provided by a community-based organization (C.B.O.) In O.S. schools, all full-service students received special academic classes; in addition, all A.I./D.P.-identified students had the option of receiving vocational counseling, skills training, educational internships, and other work-readiness services provided by FEGS staff.

All A.I./D.P. students received A.I./D.P.-funded attendance outreach, guidance, and counseling services. These services were found to be effective in serving the needs of these at-risk students. Although all A.I./D.P. students were also eligible to receive health services, the absence of separate health services records for A.I./D.P. students precluded assessment of the efficacy of this component. The school-level linkages component was aimed primarily at middle-school students meeting the A.I./D.P. attendance eligibility criteria, and had no direct impact on the performance of high school A.I./D.P. students.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Program Objectives

The Chancellor's Special Circular Number 29 established the following performance objectives for the 1985-86 high school A.I./D.P. program:

- a minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with A.I./D.P. services would have a higher attendance rate in 1985-86 than in 1984-85;
- a minimum of 50 percent of the students who failed one or more subjects the previous year would pass at least one more subject in 1985-86 than in 1984-85;
- a minimum of 50 percent of the students would be promoted to the next highest grade at the end of the 1985-86 school year; and
- starting with 1985-86 as a baseline year, a minimum of 50 percent of the students, ninth grade or below, would still be in school three years later.

Duration of Services

Analyses of student data revealed significant variations in duration of services received. Of the 5,835 students served, 50 percent (2,943) received A.I./D.P. services for the full academic year (full-year students); 19 percent (1,090) entered the program after November 1, 1985 and remained for the rest of the year (fall late-admission students); 22 percent (1,275) entered during the spring term (spring-only students); and nine percent (527) were served and then discharged during the school year. Among the program models, percentages of spring-only and discharged students were similar. However, strategies schools had a substantially higher percentage (62 percent) of full-year students than SOAR (50 percent) or O.S. (43 percent) schools. Analyses examined attendance and achievement individually by program model and duration of services.

Changes in Attendance

The program's attendance objective was not met overall, since only 39 percent of the students improved their attendance from the previous year. However, SOAR full-year (47 percent) and fall late-admission (49 percent) students and O.S. full-year (48 percent) students did meet the objective.*

Another way of examining these data is to compare 1984-85 and 1985-86 attendance rates. On average, A.I./D.P. students attended school approximately 65 percent of the time in 1984-85 and 57 percent of the time during the program year--a decline of eight percentage points. By model, SOAR students declined five percentage points (from 65 to 60 percent). Both strategies and O.S. schools declined nine percentage points (from 68 to 59 percent and from 62 to 53 percent, respectively). By grade, the attendance of ninth-graders dropped six percentage points (from 62 to 56 percent) and the attendance of tenth-graders declined seven percentage points (from 67 to 60 percent).**

---

* According to a normal curve test of the difference between proportions, the percentage of students in these groups who met the objective is not significantly different than 50 percent, the proposed target.

** These results by grade can be compared with the attendance rates of a group of ninth- and tenth-graders who attended school prior to the inception of the A.I./D.P. program and who had characteristics similar to A.I./D.P. students. Ninth-graders attended school about 63 percent of the time and tenth-graders attended 66 percent of the time during the first year that attendance was examined. During the following year, ninth-graders' attendance declined an average of 11 percentage points and tenth-graders' attendance declined an average of 8.5 percentage points.

Changes in Courses-Passed Rate

Of the 5,835 students served, 91 percent (5,289) failed at least one subject in 1984-85; of these, 74 percent (3,929) had complete course data and were included in analyses of course outcomes. Overall, the program's courses-passed objective was not met, since only 43 percent of all served students passed more courses than the previous year. However, SOAR full-year (54 percent) and fall late-admission (50 percent) students and strategies full-year (49 percent) students did meet the objective.

Overall, students in all three models passed about the same percentage of courses in 1985-86 (32 percent) as they had the previous year (30 percent). By model, SOAR students improved an average of four percentage points (from 31 to 35 percent); strategies and O.S. students each improved an average of one percent (from 31 to 32 percent and from 27 to 28 percent, respectively).

Changes in Credits Earned

Because of variations among schools in the number of credits required for promotion to the next grade, analyses of credits earned was limited to ninth-grade A.I./D.P. students. Of these, only 14 percent of the students participating in the SOAR and strategies models and seven percent of the O.S. ninth-graders earned enough credits to be promoted to the tenth grade. Clearly, the program's promotional objective was not met by ninth-graders. One reason is the high course failure rate by these at-risk students. Another reason is that most A.I./D.P. students are receiving remediation in non-credit bearing Chapter I-funded classes. The more remedial classes that students need, the fewer opportunites they have to earn credits and gain promotion to the next grade.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings in this report, the following recommendations are made:

- Alternative educational services should be provided to all A.I./D.P.-served students.
- Program administrators should consider broadening program eligibility criteria so that students with lower absence rates can be served, or so that schools have more discretion in selecting the students that they serve in the A.I./D.P. program.
- The program's promotional objectives should be adjusted to allow for variations in promotional standards in individual schools and for the lack of credits granted in remedial programs.
- Transitional guidance and attendance services should be provided to students who are no longer eligible for A.I./D.P. services.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The production of this report is the result of a collaborative effort of full and part-time staff and consultants. In addition to those whose names appear on the cover, Basima Ahed, Elly Bulkin, Warren Cohen, Richard Ducree, Roselind Eichenstein, Hanna Han, Shinae Melton, Lori Poveromo, Jeffrey Ringle, Jeffrey Shaw, Stephen Sicilian, Linda Solomon, Susan Thompson, and Jerry Woods spent many hours interviewing program administrators, coding their responses, and analyzing the data upon which this report is based. Frances Cullen has typed, corrected, and duplicated this report. The Unit could not have produced the report without their able participation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	Program Purpose	1
	Program Design	2
	School and Student Eligibility	4
	Program Objectives	7
	Evaluation Methodology	7
	Scope of this Report	9
II.	Program Implementation	10
	Program Start-Up	10
	Facilitating Services to Students	13
	Attendance Outreach	18
	Guidance and Counseling Services	22
	Health Services	27
	School Level Linkages	29
	Alternative Educational Programs	30
	Staff Development Training	42
III.	Student Outcomes	46
	Data Sources	46
	Number of Participants	46
	Student Characteristics	47
	Student Eligibility	48
	Student Discharges and Late Admissions	50
	Student Outcomes	53
IV.	Conclusions and Recommendations	67

APPENDICES

A	Data Collection Procedures	73
B	School by School Summary of Students Served and Those With Complete Attendance and Course Data	77
C	School By School Summary of Attendance and Course Improvement	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Students Served by Model and Grade	49
2	Students Served by Model and Duration of Service	51
3	Number and Percentage of Students Improving Their 1985-86 Attendance as Compared with 1984-85 by Duration of Service and Model	55
4	A Two-Year Comparison of the Average Percentage Attendance by Model and Duration of Service	56
5	Number and Percentage of Students Passing More Courses in 1985-86 than in 1984-85 by Duration of Service and Model	59
6	A Two-Year Comparison of the Average Percentage of Courses Passed by Model and Duration of Service	60
7	Median Number of Credits Earned in 1985-86 by Grade	65

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM PURPOSE

The 1985-86 Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (A.I./D.P.) program aimed at improving student attendance and achievement, reducing the dropout rate, and increasing the number of students completing school. The program, which began in 1984-85, operated in selected middle, high, and special education schools and programs having large numbers of students with excessive absences. Approximately $21.5 million in state funds were allocated to A.I./D.P. in 1985-86. The Chancellor allotted $11.6 million of these funds to the community school districts, $7.8 million to the Division of High Schools (D.H.S.), and $1.4 million to the Division of Special Education (D.S.E.). The remaining $0.7 million was reserved for evaluation costs, data collection, and dropout prevention programs operating in community-based organizations (C.B.O.s).* This report focuses on the evaluation of the A.I./D.P. program in the 26 high schools participating in the program.**

---

* A community-based organization (C.B.O.) is a community agency which contracts to provide various kinds of social, cultural, and recreational services to youth who are chronically truant, have learning difficulties, or are experiencing problems of social adjustment. Services provided can include individual, group, and family counseling; job readiness training; health services; outreach and retrieval of truant students; mediation services; and video and poetry productions, among others.

** The Office of Educational Assessment's Student Progress Evaluation Unit is evaluating the program in the middle schools, and the Special Education Evaluation Unit is evaluating the special education component of the program.

PROGRAM DESIGN

Components and Models

During its first year of implementation (1984-85), the A.I./D.P. program included nine components which provided different types of services to at-risk students. All 110 academic-comprehensive and vocational-technical high schools in the New York City public school system received at least one of these components.*

For the 1985-86 school year, the Office of High School Support Services (O.H.S.S.S.) redesigned the A.I./D.P. program to provide a more integrated array of services to those schools and students most in need of them.** Program components were reduced from nine to six, each of which was to be included in every high school's A.I./D.P. program. These six components were:

- Facilitating Services to Students. This component required a regularly licensed teacher to serve as site facilitator. The facilitator, who was freed from homeroom assignment and two other periods per day, was responsible for identifying and tracking the progress of targeted students, coordinating all program activities, and facilitating the activities of a Pupil Personnel Committee which recommended and followed up on a comprehensive program of services for each eligible student.

- Attendance Outreach. The attendance outreach component operated in addition to a school's regular daily attendance activities. It focused particularly on increasing parents' awareness of their child's poor attendance and could include incentives to motivate students to improve their attendance.

- Guidance and Counseling Services. The guidance component offered appropriate services designed to identify and address individual problems that might contribute to the poor attendance of targeted students.

---

* The 1984-85 A.I./D.P. program is described in a report titled "High School Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention Program 1984-85, Final Report," available from the Office of Educational Assessment.

** Guidelines for the 1985-86 Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention program can be found in the Chancellor's Special Circular No. 29, 1984-85 (revised), June 7, 1985.

- Health Services. This component screened targeted students for physical, psychological, and educational problems that might affect attendance, provided referrals for appropriate follow-up services, and ensured that needed services were provided.

- School Level Linkages. The linkage component focused on students moving from one level of schooling to the next. Its purpose was to develop a relationship between staff and students in the middle schools and the high schools in order to encourage student interest in their new school.

- Alternative Educational Programs. This component offered high interest programs that incorporated appropriate basic skills instruction and individualized attention to encourage better attendance and improve achievement. Alternative educational programs were supplementary to required instructional services and could only be funded through A.I./D.P. if all other components were already in place.

Principals from the 26 schools selected to participate in the program had the option of choosing one of three models for implementing the six program components.*

1. Project SOAR (Student Opportunity, Advancement, and Retention). This is a fully-designed, school-based program in which students receiving instructional services are organized into five "family" groups of 20 students. The students are block-programmed for double periods in interdisciplinary classes, receive a daily "tutorial" period, and participate in various types of enrichment activities. This model was a component in the spring, 1985 A.I/D.P. program, and is designed primarily to serve ninth- and tenth-grade students who did not amass enough credits to be promoted to the next grade (holdover students).

2. Operation Success (O.S.) O.S. is a work readiness and training program developed by Federation Employment and Guidance Services (FEGS), a community-based organization, in collaboration with the Board of Education (B.O.E.). O.S. has been in operation at several New York City high schools for a number of years, and was one of the components in the 1984-85 A.I./D.P. program. In this model, FEGS staff located at the school site provide

---

* An additional 10 high schools were part of the Dropout Prevention Program (D.P.P.), a city-funded program also targeted at high-risk students. D.P.P. is directed by the Superintendent for Dropout Prevention and was evaluated by a group at Teachers College, Columbia University.

vocational evaluation, case management, community resources and work internship coordination, and attendance outreach services, while staff at the FEGS training center on 14th Street in Manhattan provide skills training in various vocational areas. O.S. typically serves several hundred students in the school.

3. Strategies. In this model, schools could select from a menu of strategies for component implementation spelled out in the Chancellor's Special Circular No. 29, including the use of one or more C.B.O.s to deliver some portion of the services. Possible strategies included the use of teacher mentors, an in-school suspension instructional lab, an extended school day, and other more traditional forms of instructional and supportive services.

Borough Supervisors

To support this new A.I./D.P. program design, O.H.S.S.S. created the position of borough supervisor. Borough supervisors, who numbered one or more in each borough superintendent's office, were responsible for monitoring and assisting in program implementation at the individual school level.*

SCHOOL AND STUDENT ELIGIBILITY

Only those high schools with an attendance rate below the citywide median of 87 percent were eligible to receive A.I./D.P. funding.** Other factors such as a school's dropout rate and the need to ensure that students throughout the city received program services were considered in school selection. All selected high schools were expected to serve special educa-

---

* Borough supervisors had similar responsibilities for the Preparation for Raising Educational Performance (PREP) program. PREP provides theme-based instruction for ninth-grade students who are two or more years below grade level in reading, and also provides reduced class size for PREP students who are four or more years below grade level.

** These criteria were established in State Education Department guidelines.

tion students. The proportion of special education students served within each high school's A.I./D.P. program was to reflect the proportion of these students in the school.*

Program administrators allocated funds to schools utilizing the SOAR or strategies models based on the cost of operating the program for 150 eligible students per school.** One hundred of the 150 students were to receive full A.I./D.P. services, including alternative instructional services, while 50 were to receive all components except alternative instructional services. Only students with 20 or more unexcused absences during the spring, 1985 term or 40 absences during the 1984-85 school year were eligible for participation in these program models during the fall, 1985 term.*** For students entering the program in the spring, 1986 term, O.H.S.S.S.-established criteria were 20 or more unexcused absences during the fall, 1985 term or 40 or more absences during the spring, 1985 and fall, 1985 terms.

Once the formal eligibility criteria were met, SOAR and strategies school staff could use other criteria to select participants. These secondary eligibility criteria were:

---

* The special education students participating in the high school A.I./D.P. program were primarily resource room students. The Division of Special Education directed a separate special education component of A.I./D.P. that did not include the students referred to in this report.

** Bronx Regional and Lower East Side Prep, alternative high schools with smaller populations, served fewer than 150 students and received proportionately smaller allocations.

*** Both term and school-year absence criteria were necessary because records for middle school students are usually kept by year, while high school records are kept by term.

- limited proficiency in English (students who had been in an English language system for four years and had not scored at or above the 20th percentile on the Language Assessment Battery);*
- school failure (students failing three or more major subjects in the final marking period);
- overage (students two or more years overage for their grade); and
- low achievement in reading (entering ninth graders scoring at or below 7.1 in grade equivalents on the citywide reading test and entering tenth graders scoring 8.0 or below).

Different student selection criteria were employed by O.S. schools. In these schools, the number of students to be served was directly tied to the school population and dropout rate. FEGS then contracted to provide a comprehensive array of work-readiness services to all identified students, at a per-capita rate of $1,000.

In Operation Success schools, only students with 25 or more absences and two course failures during the spring, 1985 term, or 10 or more absences during September and October, 1985, and in danger of dropping out, were eligible for program participation during the fall, 1985 term. Principals also had the discretion to include some students (five percent) on the basis of their own judgment. For the spring, 1986 term, O.S. criteria included:

- twenty or more unexcused absences during the fall, 1985 term;
- failure of three or more subjects because of excessive cutting, which is defined as 40 percent or more classes cut in a marking period;

---

* The Language Assessment Battery (LAB) test is administered to all language-minority children who are new entrants to the New York City Public Schools or whose previous LAB scores entitle them to bilingual education. The test consists of several subtests, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

- ten days absent any two consecutive months in the current or previous semester; or
- referral by the principal as being at risk (a maximum of 35 such students in each school).*

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Program administrators set the following objectives for the 1985-86 high school A.I./D.P. program.

- A minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with A.I./D.P. services would have 1985-86 attendance that was better than in 1984-85.
- A minimum of 50 percent of the students provided with A.I./D.P. services would pass at least one more subject in 1985-86 than they did in 1984-85. (This applied only to participating students who failed one or more subjects during the previous year).
- A minimum of 50 percent of the high school students provided with A.I./D.P. services would earn sufficient credits to advance to the next highest grade.
- Starting with 1985-86 as a baseline year, a minimum of 50 percent of the students, ninth grade or below, provided with A.I./D.P. services would still be in school three years later.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

O.E.A. conducted a comprehensive evaluation of A.I./D.P., collecting both quantitative data on students participating in the program and qualitative data about program implementation at all 26 participating high schools. Quantitative data included:

- information related to the secondary eligibility criteria (overage, LEP, course failure, reading two or more years below grade level);

---

* Both the fall and spring criteria were negotiated between FEGS and the B.O.E. for all schools using the Operation Success model, including the D.P.P. schools.

- attendance, course, and credit information for 1984-85 and 1985-86;* and
- the duration of students' participation in A.I./D.P. and whether they received full or supportive services only.

Qualitative information included interviews with A.I./D.P. staff and students. Evaluators interviewed the borough supervisors responsible for coordination between their borough superintendent's office, central program administrators, and the A.I./D.P. schools in their boroughs, focusing on their monitoring and staff development duties and their perceptions of program effectiveness. Evaluators also interviewed the principals of the 26 high schools about the selection of each school's A.I./D.P. model, the funding of individual program components, and overall program implementation.

In addition, O.E.A. examined the program in detail at eight schools. Four of these schools (Boys and Girls, Evander Childs, Franklin K. Lane, and Washington Irving) adopted the Project SOAR model, two (Adlai E. Stevenson and Morris) developed their own strategies for component implementation, and two (DeWitt Clinton and Lafayette) were Operation Success schools.** Evaluation staff questioned the facilitator at each of the eight schools about their duties and responsibilities, the criteria used for student selection, and their perceptions of the effectiveness of each of the program's six

---

* O.E.A. obtained these data from two sources. The University Application Processing Center (U.A.P.C.) supplied 1985-86 data for students in the 21 A.I./D.P. schools using their system. Facilitators in the other five schools supplied attendance, course, and credit data using O.E.A.-developed rosters and students' permanent record cards.

** O.E.A. obtained some of the qualitative information for O.S. schools from the Teachers College group evaluating the D.P.P. program to minimize the number of interviews required of the staff in O.S. schools.

components in meeting students' needs. Evaluators asked the facilitator for the name of the person responsible for coordinating each of the other program components, and then questioned that person about his or her responsibilities and the specific services provided by the component.*

Finally, the evaluation team questioned 105 students from the sample schools about what happened when they were absent from school, whether they had ever received a reward for attending school, the type of health and guidance services available to them, and how interested they were in their courses and teachers this year.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report describes the implementation and evaluates the impact of the 1985-86 A.I./D.P. program in all 26 participating schools. Overall program organization and implementation are described in Chapter II, student outcomes are discussed in Chapter III, and conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter IV. Three appendices provide additional information on O.E.A. data collection procedures and school-by-school program implementation.

---

* Because of the importance of the attendance outreach component to assessments of the program's success, the evaluation team interviewed the attendance outreach coordinator at all 26 high schools. In addition, evaluators asked facilitators at all seven strategies schools to describe their alternative educational component in detail.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM START-UP

Model Selection

D.H.S. presented the A.I./D.P. program design and guidelines to A.I./D.P. school principals at a meeting held at O.H.S.S.S. headquarters in June. Principals then chose the model that they wished to implement in their school. In most cases (85 percent), principals made this decision after conferring with school staff members such as department heads and the Assistant Principals (A.P.s) of guidance and attendance. Sixteen of the schools chose Project SOAR, seven decided to develop their own strategies for implementing the six program components, and three chose the Operation Success model. The schools and the models they chose are listed in Appendix B.

Principals gave a variety of reasons for their choice of model. Five (71 percent) of the strategies principals and ten (63 percent) of the SOAR principals said they chose the model because it best suited the needs of the students they were serving. Four (40 percent) of these 10 SOAR principals also indicated that they had used the model during the spring, 1985 term, as did one additional SOAR principal, and two (20 percent) of the 10 said that it was the most appropriate for the skills and interests of their staff. Four (25 percent) of the 16 SOAR principals said that the SOAR model was most appropriate for their school's existing curriculum organization. One SOAR principal said that he chose the model primarily because it was a "good package;" another said that he chose SOAR because it was "pre-packaged" and they "hadn't had enough time to investigate the other options thoroughly." The principals of two strategies schools said they chose that model because

there was a particular community-based organization they wanted to work with, one strategies principal said that O.H.S.S.S. personnel had recommended this model (and the C.B.O. with which they chose to work), and another strategies principal said she chose this option because they wanted to design their A.I./D.P. model themselves.

Principals of O.S. schools had less varied reasons for choosing that model. The principal of one O.S. school said they chose the program because it had already been in operation in the school for a number of years and was working well, while the principals of the two other O.S. schools said that O.H.S.S.S. had assigned this model to them.

Program Funding

Special Circular No. 29 spelled out the types of staffing arrangements and funding requirements that the different program models might require. Allocation levels depended on the particular model and program options selected. For example, the basic SOAR model, which included the services of a part-time facilitator, three full-time teachers, one full-time guidance counselor, and two family assistants, plus an Other Than Personnel Services (O.T.P.S.) budget of $5,000, would require an expenditure of $219,000. Eight (50 percent) of the SOAR schools utilized this basic staffing plan, with the addition of one more full-time family assistant; they each received $228,457 in A.I./D.P. funds.* Five (31 percent) of the SOAR schools substituted a school neighborhood worker for a family assistant and received

---

* This was the initial specified allocation. The amount of funding a school actually received may have varied slightly.

$219,979. The remaining three SOAR schools had slightly smaller staffing requirements and therefore received smaller allocations; of these, Bronx Regional, an alternative high school serving a smaller population of students, split its allocation with Lower East Side Prep, another alternative high school which chose to utilize the strategies model.

Allocations for strategies schools varied depending on the choices they made from the menu of strategies described in Special Circular No. 29, and whether they were using a C.B.O. to deliver some of their program services. Allocations ranged from $78,993 for Lower East Side Prep to $215,584 for Christopher Columbus High School. Morris's allocation included $18,000 for services provided by the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, Seward Park received $102,000 for services provided by FEGS, and Andrew Jackson was allocated $40,000 for services provided by the Urban League.

Allocations for O.S. schools were based on a cost of $1,000 for each student served, with the number of students to be served determined by D.H.S. FEGS contracted to serve 330 students at Lafayette High School, 449 at Erasmus Hall, and 495 at DeWitt Clinton High School. If the number of students served was less than that specified, the funding received by FEGS would be reduced accordingly; however, if more than the specified number of students was served, the funding received by FEGS would not be increased from that specified in the contract. Each O.S. school also received $15,959 for the services of one family assistant to operate the school's TELSOL equipment.*

---

* TELSOL is an automated telephone dialing system which can be programmed to deliver a variety of messages to students or their parents.

FACILITATING SERVICES TO STUDENTS

Facilitator Selection and Use of Time

The program facilitator was usually the first A.I./D.P. staff member hired, with the majority of them being hired by June. All of the facilitators were teachers who had experience with at-risk students; some had worked with the A.I./D.P. program the previous year.

The number of periods that facilitators actually devoted to the program varied from school to school and from model to model. About 20 percent of the SOAR and strategies facilitators spent all day working with the program, and another 20 percent spent three or less periods coordinating the program. Most facilitators spent from five to seven periods on A.I./D.P. work. Several facilitators indicated that they also spent additional time after school and on Saturdays on such A.I./D.P.-related tasks as parent workshops and staff-development training. Overall, SOAR and strategies facilitators estimated that they spent about one-third of their A.I./D.P. time on student selection, monitoring, and follow-up; about one-fourth of their time coordinating the efforts of A.I./D.P. and C.B.O. staff; and about one-fifth of their time on paperwork. The remainder of their time was spent on such tasks as allocation of per-session and O.T.P.S. funds, staff development training, communication with O.H.S.S.S. staff members and non-A.I./D.P. school staff members, and parent and community contact.

A.I./D.P. facilitators at Operation Success sites reported a slightly different use of their time, primarily due to differences in staffing and in the number of students eligible for program services. In these schools, the efforts of A.I./D.P. school staff members were augmented by the services of FEGS personnel, both on-site and at the FEGS 14th Street training center.

Furthermore, one of the facilitator's major responsibilities was to provide FEGS case managers with the names of a large number of eligible target students, a task that was ongoing through at least the first half of the school year. For these reasons, Operation Success facilitators estimated that they spent about one-third of their time identifying students who were eligible for Operation Success services and another one-third of their time coordinating with FEGS staff. Their remaining time was spent on such tasks as parent and community contacts, preparing reports, and paperwork.

Student Selection Procedures

Means Used. Selection of students to participate in the A.I./D.P. program was one of the first tasks of A.I./D.P. facilitators. In most cases, the process began in June and involved several sources of information, including teachers' roll books, students' permanent record cards,* high school applications, feeder school records, recommendations or requests of school staff members, and student or parent requests. Theoretically, a complete permanent record card was available for all students except over-the-counter students who entered the high school without making advance arrangements. In this case, facilitators and/or school administrators tried to contact the student's former school to request that his or her permanent records be forwarded. This was not always possible, however, especially if

---

* A permanent record card is a folder containing information on a student's attendance, courses taken and passed, credits earned, standardized reading and mathematics scores, and Regents' Competency Test (R.C.T.) results throughout his or her elementary, middle, and high school education. In New York City schools, this record is passed from school to school as the student moves from one educational level to another or transfers to a different school. Students entering a New York City public school from another school system may be lacking such a permanent record card.

the student had recently arrived from another country. In a case where a student's records were not available early enough for eligibility determinations, the facilitators sought information on the student's needs from other school staff members, and then conferred with the principal to determine whether the student should receive A.I./D.P. services. Even when a student's permanent records were available, however, facilitators noted that the information provided was often incomplete or contained errors.*

SOAR and Strategies Schools. Facilitators in the sample SOAR and strategies schools said that they had no difficulty in finding at least 150 students who were eligible for A.I./D.P. services in the fall term. In making the final selection, therefore, facilitators gave preference to particular groups of students, such as in-school cutters,** students with absence rates close to the specified minimum, or those whom they believed could benefit most from the program. Some facilitators referred long term absentees or those with a very high number of absences during the previous term or year to other programs such as the General Equivalency Diploma (G.E.D.)*** program rather than including them in their A.I./D.P. program.

---

* In all New York City middle schools and in some New York City high schools, students' permanent record cards are manually maintained by pupil personnel clerical workers who sometimes either do not receive the data required or make errors in entering it on the permanent record forms. The accuracy and completeness of the data are generally better in those high schools using U.A.P.C. services. In these schools, each student's attendance, course, credit, and program information is computerized and used to automatically generate the student's program schedule and report card. Copies of these data are kept with the student's permanent records.

** A cutter is a student who attends homeroom (official class) or at least one class, but then fails to attend other classes on his or her schedule.

*** General Equivalency Diploma programs prepare students to take the G.E.D. examination. Students who take and pass this exam receive a General Equivalency Diploma, which is accepted by many employers or post-secondary educational centers in lieu of a high school diploma.

A few facilitators indicated that they placed all special education students eligible for program services in the group receiving A.I./D.P. supportive services only rather than with the group receiving full services. This practice raises the question of whether special education students were receiving the services to which they were entitled.

Although the facilitator at Lower East Side Prep said that the transient nature of the student body made roster selection difficult, most SOAR and strategies facilitators reported that few students dropped out of the program during the fall because of personal or academic difficulties. Most students who did leave the program either transferred to other schools or programs, left the area, left school due to pregnancy, failed to appear initially and were classified as an L.T.A., or were found to be ineligible by O.H.S.S.S. staff. Facilitators' estimates of the number of new students admitted to the program in the fall ranged from a low of 10 at Franklin K. Lane High School to a high of 75 at Boys and Girls High School. Facilitators continued to add students during the spring, 1986 term to replace those discharged.

Operation Success Schools. Student identification presented some problems for facilitators in O.S. schools. One difficulty was that O.S. facilitators were not sure whether they were to first identify all students eligible to receive Operation Success services or only those students selected to receive full A.I./D.P. services. The facilitator at one O.S. school began by identifying 100 A.I./D.P.-eligible students already being served by various holding power programs at the school. She submitted a list of these students' names to the FEGS site supervisor, and then submitted additional lists of names as FEGS personnel attempted to contact these students and enroll them in the O.S. program. By contrast, the facilitators

at the other two O.S. schools submitted more extensive lists of eligible students at the beginning of the fall term. Facilitators continued to provide students' names to FEGS staff throughout the fall and spring terms to meet FEGS contract requirements and to replace those discharged.

Pupil Personnel Committee

Program guidelines specified that one of the duties of the facilitator was to chair meetings of the Pupil Personnel Committee, which was to coordinate plans for program services delivered to each individual student, monitor and evaluate these services, and oversee parent and community outreach efforts. The committee was to include representatives from A.I./D.P. components plus a school administrator and one or more parents.

Facilitators indicated that such a committee was formed at each A.I./D.P. school. At the six SOAR and strategies sample schools, the administrative representative was usually an assistant principal, while the attendance component was represented by the school's attendance coordinator or one of the family assistants. Guidance was represented by the A.I./D.P. guidance counselor, and health services by the Health Resources Coordinator. In two of the sample schools, the parent representative was the P.T.A. president; at one school, five parents worked on a rotating basis; in the other three instances, a volunteer parent was selected by the facilitator.

Committee meetings began at about one-third of the schools early in the fall term, but in other cases the committee's first meeting was not held until October or November or even later. After the initial meeting, subsequent meetings were usually held monthly. Topics discussed included such subjects as attendance and incentives procedures, how to keep key people

involved in the program, and the possibility of making day care available at the school for students with small children.

ATTENDANCE OUTREACH

The attendance outreach component at virtually all of the A.I./D.P. schools had three major elements: 1) the careful monitoring and reporting of students' attendance by teachers and regular school attendance personnel, 2) intensive efforts by outreach workers to notify parents of their child's attendance problems, and 3) the use of incentives to help motivate students to attend school. In addition, guidance counselors, teachers, and other A.I./D.P. staff frequently made personal phone calls to absent students, and C.B.O. staff monitored students' attendance at off-site work or training locations.

Every A.I./D.P. school received funding for A.I./D.P. attendance outreach staff. Most SOAR and strategies schools received funding for two full-time family assistants to do attendance outreach work; some opted to use a neighborhood worker, social worker, or school aide instead of a family assistant.

Monitoring of a student's daily attendance was normally the responsibility of the school's regular attendance personnel, which typically included an attendance teacher and/or attendance coordinator, family assistants, and one or more TELSOL operators. In most cases, attendance was taken in homeroom and every class by the teacher, and reported to the attendance office. If an A.I./.D.P. student in a SOAR or strategies program began missing classes without explanation, an A.I./D.P. family assistant would send a postcard or letter to the student's home asking if there were any difficulties and if the school could help. One or more of the student's teachers or counselors might call or write the student as well. If the

unexcused absences persisted, the student's name would be put on the TELSOL system and TELSOL calls and letters would be generated; if the student still had not returned to school or provided a satisfactory explanation for his/her absences, a family assistant, school neighborhood worker, or social worker would visit the student's home. On average, SOAR and strategies attendance personnel made 146 TELSOL and 66 personal phone calls, sent 26 TELSOL and 38 personal letters, and made 12 home visits weekly.

A.I./D.P. students in O.S. schools received the normal attendance monitoring provided to all students in that school. However, school attendance data were also provided to the FEGS office. If an absent student was enrolled in the Operation Success program, the FEGS outreach worker and case manager would attempt to contact him or her via TELSOL or personally. The FEGS outreach worker at Erasmus High School estimated that staff made between 60 and 100 TELSOL calls and 15 personal phone calls daily, sent 10 to 12 TELSOL letters daily, and generated between 80 and 150 computerized post cards weekly.* In addition, case managers had between one and five parent conferences daily, and the outreach worker made three to five home visits weekly. Similar estimates were made by the Clinton and Lafayette FEGS outreach workers, although home visits and parent conferences were somewhat less frequent at these two schools, and FEGS personnel at Clinton did not utilize the TELSOL equipment.

---

* The Erasmus outreach worker noted that because the students they were trying to reach were a mobile population, the telephone numbers and addresses that they received from school attendance workers were often incorrect, with the consequence that many attempts to contact truant students were unsuccessful.

To shed light on these outreach efforts from another perspective, questions pertaining to attendance procedures were included in a student attitude survey. The survey was completed by 105 students at eight of the sample schools. About 90 percent of the students from each model indicated that at least sometimes, someone from school called their homes when they were absent. This strategy seemed to work, since nearly three-fourths (72 percent) of the students said that their parents talked to them about their attendance after a telephone call from the school. Nineteen percent said that their parents actually went to their school to talk to someone about their absences, and nine percent said that their parents "grounded" them after a call from the school about their attendance.

Most A.I./D.P. schools used incentives to encourage good attendance by the students. Nearly one half of the schools rewarded good attendance by giving students small items such as rulers, pens, watches, gift certificates, and tapes; about one-third gave clothing items such as t-shirts, gym shorts, and school jackets; and about 20 percent of the schools had parties or breakfasts, or gave the students free "fast food" vouchers. Trips were also a popular incentive. Nearly one-third of the schools took good attendees to events such as plays, movies, concerts, or dances; about one-quarter took them on sight-seeing trips to places such as the I.B.M. gallery, the World Trade Center, and museums; and about one-fifth took them on recreational outings such as baseball games, Rye Playland, Flushing Park, and Bear Mountain.

Nearly two-thirds of the schools gave the students certificates for good attendance and held special assemblies or awards ceremonies for them, about a quarter of the schools gave good attenders additional job counseling, and

a few schools rewarded good attendance with an internship in a school office or the opportunity to do peer tutoring. The majority of schools said that both attendance and achievement were taken into account in determining which students could go on trips or would receive awards; nearly 20 percent also took the student's attitude and citizenship behavior into account.

Over two-fifths (43 percent) of the students responding to the attitude survey said that school staff had promised them special rewards for good attendance. In SOAR and strategies schools, 29 percent of the students stated that they had been given t-shirts for good attendance, 14 percent reported that they had received tickets to movies, and 30 percent said that they had been given other attendance rewards such as watches, pens, and calculators. None of the students from O.S. schools reported receiving any attendance rewards. This is not surprising since O.S. schools did not have A.I./D.P. funds available for such incentives.

A few A.I./.D.P. schools developed unique outreach techniques. At Andrew Jackson High School, for example, the weekly attendance percentage of each A.I./D.P. homeroom group was tabulated and posted in a conspicuous place. Walton and Christopher Columbus outreach workers sent commendation letters to students who had done well. Several schools made early morning wake-up calls, and a few schools had their outreach workers walk around in the neighborhood to try to find truant A.I./D.P. students.

Although Special Circular No. 29 indicated that a special stipend would be available to cover attendance outreach communication and transportation costs, most schools reported that these expenses were paid for by A.I./D.P. O.T.P.S. funds. On average, A.I./.D.P. schools spent $219 on postage, $478

on communication costs, and $275 on carfare.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES

The third component of the 1985-86 program was designed to provide the supportive services needed to identify and address individual problems that could be contributing to the poor attendance of A.I./D.P. students. These services were to be provided to all 150 students in a school's A.I./D.P. program. In addition, FEGS contracted to provide guidance and counseling services to all students enrolled in the Operation Success program.

School A.I./D.P. Guidance Services

Nearly all of the SOAR and strategies schools hired a guidance counselor to work full time with their A.I./D.P. students. Exceptions were the two alternative schools, Bronx Regional and Lower East Side Prep, in which a staff guidance counselor devoted two or three periods a day to A.I./D.P. students, and Christopher Columbus High School, which opted to have a full-time school psychologist and full-time social worker provide these services.

Guidance personnel provided a range of supportive services to A.I./D.P. students and their parents. On average, A.I./D.P. counselors in SOAR and strategies schools counseled 10 individual students a day and conducted about three group guidance sessions a week on such topics as school and career planning, the need for birth control, and the dangers of drug use. Counselors also recommended students for A.I./D.P. services, assisted students with transition into and out of the program, conferred with other staff members about A.I./D.P. students' needs, and assisted with the A.I./D.P. school level linkages effort. In addition, they referred students to mental health, medical, and dental clinics; to specialized services agencies such as the Bureau of Child Welfare or the Committee on the Handicapped; or to

alternative educational opportunities such as vocational training, the High School for Pregnant Girls, or G.E.D. programs.

A.I./D.P. guidance counselors also had frequent contact with students' parents. Most counselors met with some parents at least once a day, and spoke to other parents on the telephone several times during the course of the day. Eighty percent of the sample SOAR and strategies schools also put on one or more special workshops for the parents of A.I./D.P. students. Workshops held early in the year focused mainly on acquainting parents more fully with the A.I./D.P. program, while later ones dealt with the particular educational and emotional needs of A.I./D.P. youngsters, such as the need for realistic educational planning, relationships between parents and children, problems associated with step-parenting, and the like. The number of parents attending such workshops varied from 11 to 50, with attendance in the spring usually lower than that in the fall. Only one of the sample schools reported receiving A.I./D.P. funding to underwrite the costs of such workshops.

SOAR and strategies students who completed the A.I./D.P. student attitude survey reported varying uses of the guidance services available. Less than half (43 percent) of the SOAR students reported going to a guidance counselor if they had a problem or felt upset, while about one-third (31 percent) turned to a teacher. Other guidance staff approached by SOAR students included a grade advisor (13 percent), neighborhood worker (12 percent), family assistant (10 percent), A.I./D.P. facilitator (7 percent), school psychologist (5 percent), and social worker (3 percent). By contrast, nearly nine-tenths (86 percent) of the strategies students reported going to a guidance counselor, almost two-thirds (59 percent) turned to the A.I./D.P.

facilitator, and nearly one third (32 percent) confided in a family assistant. Other types of counseling or teaching staff were turned to much less frequently by strategies students. The reasons for the differential usages of guidance and teaching staff by SOAR and strategies schools are unclear. However, the fact that SOAR students turned to teachers quite frequently suggests that the program structure promoted the development of close relationships with individual teachers, while the fact that strategies students relied heavily on guidance counselors and family assistants as well as the A.I./D.P. facilitator suggests that in strategies schools, the guidance element was more dominant.

More than 90 percent of the strategies students reported that they had participated in group counseling, and about 80 percent said they had received individual counseling from a counselor, social worker, or psychologist. Slightly more than one-half of the SOAR students reported receiving at least one of these type of counseling. The kinds of problems usually discussed were poor grades (strategies - 69 percent, SOAR - 38 percent), job decisions for the future (strategies - 50 percent, SOAR - 31 percent), cutting school (strategies 50 percent, - SOAR 25 percent), feeling upset over personal problems (strategies - 36 percent, SOAR - seven percent), and wanting to quit school (strategies - 32 percent, SOAR - eight percent).

FEGS Guidance Services

At Operation Success sites, students interested in receiving O.S. services were first interviewed by a FEGS case manager, who explained the various services offered by the program and, if appropriate, attempted to enroll the student. Once the student was enrolled, the case manager, in

conjunction with the student, school staff, and other FEGS personnel, developed an individual goal plan which took into account the student's educational, vocational, and personal problems and needs. This plan was monitored on an on-going basis and changed as needed.

Data collected by O.E.A. staff indicate that as of June 30, 1986, 568 students were enrolled in the O.S. program at Erasmus Hall High School, 273 at Lafayette, and 509 at DeWitt Clinton. On the average, each of the 1,340 enrollees at the three O.S. schools had had 1.4 discrete experiences with FEGS guidance and counseling services. These 1,846 instances of service broke down as follows: 477 instances of on-site group counseling, 460 instances in which a student was enrolled for diagnostic vocational evaluation, 431 cases where students and/or their parents received family services, 246 referrals to other in-school programs or services, and 236 instances in which students and/or their parents were referred to community resources.*

FEGS site supervisors at the sample O.S. sites indicated that their staff included three case managers, an attendance outreach worker, a vocational evaluator, a community resources specialist, an educational internship specialist, and a clerk typist. The primary responsibilities of the case workers were to orient students to the program, develop case plans, provide individual and group counseling, and make classroom career education presentations. In addition, case managers referred students to other FEGS or school staff as needed, coordinated FEGS efforts with those of school staff, monitored students' progress in school and program activities, conferred

---

* In addition, there were 591 instances of alternative educational services, including 257 referrals for part-time jobs, 210 registrations for skills training, and 124 educational internship enrollments. These services are described in more detail later in this report.

with students' parents, and documented the services provided. Case managers estimated that roughly one-half of their time was spent on personal counseling, and nearly 25 percent was consumed by paperwork. An O.E.A. staff member making a site visit noted that students constantly stopped by the FEGS office to talk with FEGS staff and seemed very comfortable in doing so; a case manager at the school said that one reason students enrolled in O.S. was that they believed they would get more personal attention than they could from school guidance staff with larger case loads.

Many of the students enrolled in O.S. also received diagnostic vocational evaluation. FEGS staff used a number of instruments, including work samples and computerized tests, to learn more about the student's vocational aptitude, skills, and interests. When not testing students, FEGS evaluators assisted in identifying and recruiting students for the program.

The community resource specialist (C.R.S.) at each O.S. school site was responsible for identifying and establishing relationships with community resources in such areas as counseling, housing, legal services, and job training. In addition to referring students to these resources, C.R.S.s arranged in-school awareness activities such as guest speakers, films, seminars, group discussions, and special events.

Operation Success students who completed the A.I./D.P. student attitude survey reported that they relied heavily on guidance counselors and teachers when they had a problem or felt upset. Nearly three-fourths (73 percent) turned to an A.I./D.P. or FEGS guidance counselor and about two-fifths (41 percent) turned to an A.I./D.P. teacher in this situation; other school sources of personal assistance were used much less frequently. About 50 percent of these students received group counseling and nearly 80 percent

received individual counseling. Problems most frequently discussed were poor grades (50 percent), job decisions (50 percent), family difficulties (46 percent), cutting school (41 percent), feeling upset over personal problems (37 percent), and wanting to quit school (18 percent).

HEALTH SERVICES

The health services component of the A.I./D.P. program was designed to provide screening, diagnostic testing, and health services referrals for A.I./D.P. students who might have health problems that could adversely affect school attendance and performance. However, it appears that in most cases, these services were already available in the schools, and that A.I./D.P. students were not given any special attention.

Personnel making up a school's health services staff usually included the following:

- A Health Resources Coordinator (H.R.C.) hired by the Department of Health. These professionals were required by the Department of Health to have a Master's Degree or two years experience in health or a counseling-related field. All of the H.R.C.s in the O.E.A. sample had at least a Bachelor's degree in a health or counseling related field, one was also a Licensed Practical Nurse (L.P.N.), and one had worked for the Health Resources Administration and in a hospital. These H.R.C.s served all of the students in the school, not just A.I./D.P. students. Their duties were to screen the students, provide health information, and link them with medical services and follow-up.

- A health aide who performed vision and hearing tests, did immunizations, and provided first aid.

- A visiting physician from the Department of Health who gave physical examinations to students who wished to participate in certain sports (football, etc.) or wanted to obtain working papers, plus follow-up examinations for students who appeared to have a potentially serious health problem.

Supplementary personnel could include a school neighborhood worker who made home visits to ailing students, an A.I./D.P. health education teacher, and non-school health service providers in hospitals and clinics.

Estimates of the number of A.I./D.P. students receiving these health services were difficult to obtain because separate figures for A.I./D.P. students were not maintained in many cases. However, data suggest that vision and hearing testing were the most frequently used services, followed by diagnostic screening and referrals. Most referrals were made to nearby clinics and family-care centers, although a small number of referrals to mental health services and for dental care were also made. The health resource coordinators commented that the services provided by the outside agencies were usually excellent, and that the primary reason such health services might not be totally effective was that students sometimes failed to show up for appointments. Students were provided with referral forms which they were supposed to return to the health resources coordinator; if the student failed to do so, the H.R.C. either called the health services provider to see whether the appointment had been kept, or asked the student to come to the health office.

Efforts were also made to provide health education to both A.I./D.P. and non-A.I./D.P. students. About three-fourths of the H.R.C.s interviewed by O.E.A. had gone into classes to make presentations and lead discussions on such topics as contraception and drug abuse. In addition, some counseled students individually at the request of the A.I./D.P. coordinator. At one school, a psychologist from a mental health center had presented a program on suicide prevention attended by about 85 students; at another, Planned Parenthood of New York City presented a program to 150 students on sexually transmitted diseases.

SCHOOL LEVEL LINKAGES

The school level linkages component of the A.I./D.P. program was intended to facilitate the transition of target students from intermediate or junior high school into high school, and did not directly affect the A.I./D.P. high school students. The effort was under the overall direction of O.H.S.S.S. staff, and involved a linkages coordinator (a facilitator, guidance counselor, or both) at each school level.

High schools were usually paired with the intermediate and junior high schools that were their primary feeder schools. Among the high schools included in the sample, the number of such feeder schools ranged from two to six. Feeder schools were responsible for selecting the students to be served by the component, using the same A.I./D.P. absence criteria as used by the high schools.

Linkage activities took several forms. One of the most common was visits to the high school by feeder school students to hear presentations on the offerings and facilities available in the school, tour classrooms and athletic facilities, participate in after-school skills classes or athletic activities, attend school concerts or plays, or receive peer tutoring from high school students. In the case of the strategies schools in the sample, such visits occurred weekly for a period of two or two-and-one-half hours; in the case of the SOAR schools, the visits were described as frequent. In addition, one strategies school had guidance staff individually interview each middle school student scheduled to attend that high school, and one SOAR school made their tutorial staff available to visiting middle-school students. Another SOAR school was planning to send nine high school students

into three feeder schools for several hours three days a week to provide an orientation to high school, and to have middle school students come to the high school to shadow individual high school students as they went about their daily activities.

ALTERNATIVE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program guidelines defined this component as high interest programs that incorporate appropriate basic skills with individualized attention, and further stipulated that these programs were to be supplementary to required instructional services. However, Circular No. 29 also presented formats in which alternative educational services could be provided in the three program models -- formats that did not always separate these services from required educational services. For this reason, both required and alternative instructional services provided to A.I./D.P. students in the three program models are described below.

Project SOAR Schools

Circular No. 29 defined two types of alternative educational programs that could be implemented by SOAR schools.* All of the SOAR schools in the 1985-86 A.I./D.P. program elected to utilize Type 1. Three of the facilitators in the SOAR sample schools said that they chose the Type 1 program because it simplified planning and ensured that students were getting the

---

* In the Type 1 plan, each school was to identify several groups of 20 students. Each group would form a family for block programming in interdisciplinary classes meeting for double periods. Course credit would be based upon mastery of material and number of hours attended in subject area classes. Additionally, each student was to be programmed for a tutorial period each day. In the Type 2 plan, course materials would be modified into units or modules of study that could be completed on a variable time schedule by at-risk students returning to school at various times of the year.

academic assistance they needed while also having sufficient time for guidance and enrichment activities. One of these facilitators plus the facilitator at the fourth sample school said that their school was not set up for a Type 2 modular program.

In all cases, the A.I./D.P. facilitators selected the teachers to participate in the program. Some of the teachers had participated in the SOAR program before and all had extensive experience with at-risk students.

Of the four SOAR sample schools, three had five groups of 20 full service SOAR students, and one had obtained permission from O.H.S.S.S. to have four groups of 25 students each. Two of the schools grouped the students by reading ability or primary academic focus, while two arranged the students' programs on the basis of scheduling considerations. However, none of these groups were completely block programmed; that is, not all of the students remained together in the same classes throughout the day, and the classes were held in different areas of the building.

Although guidelines stated that SOAR classes were to be interdisciplinary and for double periods, the schedules reported by facilitators in the four sample SOAR schools indicated that these requirements were only partially met. All four schools scheduled a double period of English, and three scheduled a single tutorial* period plus periods for mathematics and social studies. The scheduling of the rest of students' programs varied from

---

* A tutorial is a regularly-scheduled, credit bearing period which a school can use for several purposes, including independent study, remediation, or enrichment activities. In an independent study project, the student and teacher develop a contract for the work to be done. For example, a student can contract to make up the work for a course he or she has failed in order to advance to the next level.

school to school. Washington Irving High School, an educational options school, had one double period combining accounting and data processing and another double period combining secretarial studies and word processing; the other schools scheduled single periods in such subjects as science, health, and music.

Both Evander Childs and Washington Irving High Schools made the last (eighth) period of the day a tutorial, Franklin K. Lane scheduled it for the first period of the day, and Boys and Girls High School scheduled it at different periods of the day, depending on the student's overall schedule. In the latter instance, the emphasis was on writing improvement for all students; in the other cases, tutorial activities varied from school to school. In Franklin K. Lane, each tutorial had a different thrust; for example, the students in one tutorial were producing a magazine, the students in another tutorial were involved in computer training, while the students in the third tutorial were engaged in a jogging program. At Washington Irving, students pursued independent study in one of three subjects: social studies, typing, or computer data processing. At Evander Childs, teachers and students worked together on a one-to-one basis on individually-chosen subjects. In most cases, the tutorial period was under the direction of a SOAR teacher, although in at least one school, other personnel such as guidance staff were also involved.

All of the schools also provided special enrichment activities to their SOAR students. The most frequent type of activity was off-site trips such as bowling or roller skating, visits to local colleges or neighborhoods of special interest such as Little Italy, or cultural events such as a Broadway show. Student participation in such trips usually ranged from 25 to 50

percent.

Two SOAR facilitators said that their school had no special grading or credit-granting practices. One said that all of the classes had attendance criteria built into the grading, while the tutorial had a pass/fail grading system; another said that one-half credit was given for job experience.

On the whole, SOAR students were very enthusiastic about the academic component of their program. Seventy-five percent of the students completing the A.I./D.P. student attitude survey reported that the courses they were taking this year were more interesting than those they took last year, 84 percent believed that their teachers were more helpful, 82 percent said that they felt more comfortable in school this year, 79 percent believed that the work was at the right level for them, and 90 percent said that classes were small enough for them to get individual attention from the teacher. Several of the students said that they hoped that they could be in the same program next year, and one even said that she would like to be in it for the rest of her high school years. However, not everyone liked all aspects of the program. Four of the students said that their courses were too easy and not exciting enough, three said that they did not like having their home called so much, two indicated that they would like the opportunity to work or have an educational internship, and one suggested that more attention be given to cutters.

Strategies Schools

In contrast to the SOAR schools, strategies schools were not given a fixed format for integrating their alternative educational component with required instructional services. However, to ensure that the mandated

number of students received full services, six of the seven strategies schools placed 100 students in self-contained official classes and also block programmed them to some degree.* The block normally included English, mathematics, social studies, and at least one high interest class such as art, music, printing, computer skills, or merchandising. At least two of the schools also included a career exploration or career guidance period in the block, and two included lunch period and gym. Some of the blocking was done by reading or mathematics skill level.

Career Education/Work Study Option. Circular No. 29 spelled out three techniques that strategies schools could use to provide an alternative educational component to their full-service A.I./D.P. students. All seven schools selected the career education/work study option,** although the reasons given for this choice by program facilitators were varied. Facilitators at Morris, Andrew Jackson, and Seward Park High Schools said that

---

* The exception was Lower East Side Prep, which was serving a relatively small number of A.I./D.P. students and did not separate them from other students in the school.

** Per Circular No. 29, this strategy was designed to encourage better attendance through instructional strategies which emphasize the connection between school and future work experiences and career aspirations. These programs utilize instructional strategies (career readiness, job readiness/life skills, job shadowing), work study/internships, and business enterprise experiences to motivate at-risk students. Available funding included a .6 teacher position, $10,000 for instructional equipment based on need, $5,000 for instructional materials based on need, and $5,400 for transportation (30 trips per student for 100 students).

there was a particular C.B.O. that they wanted to work with; facilitators at Adlai Stevenson and Julia Richman High Schools said they chose this option because they felt it would be the most beneficial for their students (Morris gave this reason as well); and the facilitator at Christopher Columbus High School said that a work/study component in communications fit in well with the curriculum they already had available. Lower East Side Prep opted to use this strategy because several work/study programs were already in operation at the school.

Morris High School, whose program name was Project VISTA (for Volunteer Internship Service Training Academy), utilized the services of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies in its alternative education program. The services provided by this C.B.O. included daily career guidance classes for all 100 A.I./D.P. instructional students, plus internships at institutions such as Bronx Lebanon Memorial Hospital and the Daughters of Jacob. Forty-seven students were interviewed for internships and 39 were placed; these students worked two hours a day, two days a week. The C.B.O. also loaned the program video equipment for use in career guidance classes, and donated $4,000 for the purchase of various types of life-skills materials. In addition to the career services provided by the C.B.O., Morris guidance staff provided a twice-weekly career education class, plus one free period weekly for individual consultations.

About 40 A.I./D.P. students at Andrew Jackson High School elected to participate in career guidance activities provided by the Urban League. These activities included a tutorial period three mornings a week, job orientation activities such as mock interviews and trips to typical work sites two afternoons a week, and individually scheduled counseling sessions.

Seward Park contracted with FEGS to provide some career education/work study services to its "Operation Future" students. The services provided were somewhat less extensive than those provided by FEGS to A.I./D.P. students at the three Operation Success schools. At Seward Park, FEGS on-site staff was limited to one case manager, who explained program services, did vocational assessments, helped students fill out job applications, and provided individual career counseling. Skills training was also available at the FEGS 14th Street site. In addition to these FEGS-provided services, Seward Park school staff provided career counseling to its A.I./D.P. students.

Two of the strategies schools elected to make their own internship and part-time job placements. However, the facilitators at both Adlai Stevenson and Julia Richman High School reported some difficulties in making these placements. The Stevenson facilitator said that they had found it difficult to try to make such arrangements for 100 students without the help of a C.B.O. The facilitator at Julia Richman said that she got job listings from two O.H.S.S.S. coordinators and sent about 30 students to interviews with a referral letter, but that only a few students were placed because the jobs were either not available yet or had already been taken.

The remaining two strategies schools took a somewhat different approach to providing a career education/work study program. At Christopher Columbus High School, A.I./D.P personnel set up a communications center with a video theme, in which students received a double period of communication arts, a keyboarding class, and the use of special video equipment. Between 60 to 70 A.I./D.P. students participated in these activities, including some from the supportive-services only group. At Lower East Side Prep, several career-related programs, sponsored in part by University Settlement (a social

services agency which had maintained a part-time social worker on site for a number of years), were available to all students in the school. The facilitator reported that about seven A.I./D.P. students were attending half-day classes at Manhattan Vocational Technical Center; about eleven were participating in after-school classes in word processing, typing, and computers at other high schools such as Automotive and Westinghouse High Schools; and almost half of the students in the school had part-time jobs. In addition, the A.I./D.P. facilitator provided career education and employment counseling to A.I./D.P. students.

In-School Suspension Instructional Lab Option. Another alternative educational option available to strategies schools was an in-school suspension instructional lab.* Although none of the strategies schools elected this option, only two gave a specific reason for not choosing it. One facilitator said that his school did not use this technique because it was not appropriate for their students; another said that they were not sure what such a lab was.

Extended School Day Option. The third alternative educational strategy was an extended school day.** None of the strategies schools elected to use

---

* In an in-school suspension instructional lab, students are removed temporarily from the school mainstream and assigned to a self-contained, small-group alternative setting for intensive counseling and other appropriate support services, while individualized instructional support is provided to insure that progress in subject areas is maintained.

** In this option, schools would be kept open for two days a week from 3:00-5:00 p.m. to provide a coordinated program of educational, recreational, and pupil-support activities. More than $20,000 could be budgeted to provide 120 per-session hours for each of three teachers, 60 per-session hours each for two teacher-mentors, and six hours per week for each of five high school student aides.

this option. Of the six facilitators giving a reason for this decision, one said that it was hard to get students to stay after school to study, and another said that they already had a similar program of their own. Four said that they offered limited before-school or after-school extracurricular activities instead. At Seward Park High School, about 10 A.I./D.P. students came to school at 7:00 a.m. to participate in a swimming class, and another 10 stayed after school to work on a magazine. At Adlai Stevenson, about 18 students stayed after school to participate in a computer workshop. At Andrew Jackson, roughly 40 students participated in after-school career exploration sessions put on by the Urban League. Christopher Columbus High School offered three after-school activities on different nights so that a student could participate in more than one; about 10 students participated in the dance program, and about 15 each participated in a video workshop and a newspaper/magazine workshop.

Student Attitudes. Like the SOAR students, strategies students generally had very positive feelings about the program. Ninety-one percent of the attitude survey respondents said that the classes were small enough for them to get individual attention from the teacher and that their teachers were more helpful this year than last. Eighty-six percent felt more comfortable in school and 80 percent believed that the courses they were taking this year were more interesting than last year. However, only about two-thirds (68 percent) felt that the work this year was at the right level for them. Although none of the students gave a specific reason for this response, many of them had specific suggestions for program improvement, including "more enjoyable" subjects such as business and childcare, better materials, more use of computers, more trips, and early release from school so that they could work.

Operation Success Schools

In Operation Success schools, the alternative education component was a source of some confusion during the 1985-86 school year. The Erasmus Hall facilitator understood it to refer to the skills training and educational internships provided by FEGS,* while the facilitators at the other two O.S. schools understood it to be the academic programs provided to full-service A.I./D.P. students by the school. This question was not fully resolved by the end of the school year. Nonetheless, each of the schools provided special academic classes funded by non-A.I./D.P. allocations to most of the students enrolled in O.S. In addition, some students at all three schools received skills training and educational internships from FEGS. Part-time jobs developed by FEGS staff were also usually included in this category of

---

* As spelled out in Attachment 3 of Circular No. 29, educational internships provided by a C.B.O. are intended to provide career exposure, motivation, and exploration of community not-for-profit agencies and local businesses. Students have the opportunity to explore vocational areas in which they have interest and strengths as determined by a Diagnostic Vocational Evaluation and personal interviews. Placement sites are developed by the educational internship developer, and a plan is developed for each student, including a contract that establishes criteria for student participation in school and educational internships.

Skills training at the C.B.O. is used when appropriate to prepare students for competitive employment with a career path while they attend school in pursuit of a high school diploma or G.E.D. For some students, this experience will be a vocational exploration giving them opportunities to experience more than one area of interest and aptitude; others will be prepared for a specific occupation into which they can move upon completion of high school. A flexible work and school schedule is determined by the school and C.B.O. This can include, but is not limited to, school attendance during mornings or afternoons only, or block schedules of several weeks of school followed by several weeks of work. Conferences, individual counseling sessions, and crisis intervention by case managers provide a continuum of services and support to the student.

services.

At DeWitt Clinton, many A.I./D.P. students were placed in block-programmed, shortened-day, theme-taught classes funded by tax-levy dollars. At Lafayette, A.I./D.P. students were selected primarily from PREP, SWAP (Students With a Purpose), and COBY (Career Opportunities for Brooklyn Youth) classes funded by P.S.E.N. (Pupils with Special Educational Needs) and tax-levy dollars. At Erasmus Hall High School, some A.I./D.P. students participated in G.E.D. classes (including one taught at FEGS' 14th Street Center), while others were placed in special classes known as Academic Improvement Classes (A.I.C.) or in classes particularly designed to serve L.T.A.s. Both types of classes were funded by tax-levy dollars. Some of the L.T.A. classes were also held at FEGS' 14th Street Center.

Alternative education services provided by FEGS included skills training, educational internships, and part-time jobs. The major skills training areas included jewelry, major appliance repair, air conditioning, building maintenance, business, reprographics, and upholstery. As noted earlier in this report, only 210 (16 percent) of the students receiving O.S. services enrolled for skills training. FEGS staff members suggested that the low enrollment was due partially to the fact that students had to travel to 14th Street in Manhattan to receive it -- a trip that normally took more than an hour for Lafayette and Clinton students. To ameliorate the travel factor, Erasmus and Clinton offered some academic services, including G.E.D. classes, at the 14th Street Center. Other factors that may have contributed to low enrollment were the limited number of skills areas offered, and the fact that students may have encountered difficulty in obtaining the required consent letter from one of their parents.

Sixteen percent (210) of the O.S. students received part-time job referrals; of these, about half (100) were actually placed. Many job placement referrals were obtained by coordinators at O.H.S.S.S.; others were solicited by the FEGS educational internship specialist or other FEGS staff members. These jobs included supermarket, fast food, and other retail placements.

Only nine percent (124) of the O.S. students were placed in educational internships in organizations such as nursing homes, hospitals, and other schools. Students received course credit for these internships, plus a small stipend from FEGS for travel and/or lunch on days they were working. FEGS staff suggested that the lack of payment other than the stipend may have discouraged some students from participating in the internship program.

On the whole, A.I./D.P. students at Operation Success sites were happy with the academic services they received from their schools. Seventy-three percent of the O.S. students surveyed said that their teachers were more helpful than those they had had the previous year; several students commented that this was because the teachers tried hard to explain the work in a way that the students could understand. Seventy-three percent also said that the work was at the right level; those students who did not agree felt that the work was too easy. Interestingly, only 45 percent of the O.S. survey respondents said that the classes they were taking this year were more interesting than those they'd taken the previous year. While 86 percent of the sample students said that they were more comfortable in school this year than last year, only 63 percent said that classes were small enough to get individual attention from their teachers. Nearly 30 percent of the students said that they would like harder classes or more classes so that they could earn extra credits and learn more.

About 30 percent of the respondents said that they came to Operation Sucess by November, 1986; the remainder came to the program in February, March, or April. More than 70 percent of these O.S. participants were enrolled in a special academic program such as AUX, SWAP, Spark, or Human Relations; the remaining 30 percent said that they were not participating in such a program.

By and large, these students made heavy use of the O.S. facilities. About one-half of them said that they stopped by the FEGS office several times a week, and the remainder indicated that they had visited the office frequently. Roughly one-third of the visits were related to skills training, internships, or job applications, but the majority were to obtain help with personal problems, to discuss problems in getting along with teachers, or just to chat. Several students made enthusiastic comments about the help they received from O.S. staff. For example, one student said that they were "great people," and another said that they gave her a sense of belonging to a family.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT TRAINING

A.I./D.P. staff received training from three sources: O.H.S.S.S., each school's borough supervisor, and the school's A.I./D.P. facilitator.

O.H.S.S.S.

O.H.S.S.S. staff used monthly facilitators' meetings at its headquarters as the primary A.I./D.P. training mechanism. Most A.I./D.P. facilitators reported that they attended these meetings on a regular basis. Guidance counselors also reported that they had been invited to attend three or four

meetings, and attendance personnel said that one facilitators' meeting in the fall and one in January were devoted to attendance problems and issues.

Staff members rated these training sessions on a scale from very effective (1) to very ineffective (5). In general, staff members who were experienced in working with at-risk students felt that the meetings were of limited effectiveness, while less experienced staff members found them very effective. Some staff members said that the time (1:00 - 3:00 p.m.) and location (downtown Brooklyn) of the meetings was inconvenient, and some objected to the fixed agenda on the grounds that it precluded discussion of other topics that might be more pressing.

In addition to the facilitators' meetings, O.H.S.S.S. sponsored several workshops in March and April for A.I./D.P. teachers on such topics as non-traditional teaching methods and the use of computers in the classroom. Teachers from about one-half of the sample schools attended. Most rated the workshops as effective or very effective. A few teachers also reported that a "linkages liaison" person from the central office had come to their school to prepare them for dealing with middle school youngsters who would be visiting the schools as part of the linkages program; they said that it helped them "tune in" to the needs of these incoming students.

Borough Supervisors

Each A.I./D.P. school was also visited regularly by their borough supervisor. Depending on the number of schools they were monitoring and their other duties, supervisors visited each school every two or three weeks to examine program documents, discuss program status and needs with the facilitator and other A.I./D.P. staff members, and visit classes. Most borough supervisors also reported frequent telephone contact with A.I./D.P.

school staff.

On the whole, school staff members found these visits to be beneficial, especially in the areas of curriculum innovation, budgeting, scheduling of linkages visits, and the use of attendance incentives. Facilitators in schools in the Bronx and Brooklyn also mentioned borough-wide meetings for A.I./D.P. staff at which ideas and experiences were exchanged; they found these to be "very beneficial."

School-Level Training

Most A.I./D.P. staff members believed that the on-going training, planning, sharing, and problem-solving that took place at their own school was of the greatest value to them in working with A.I./D.P. students. Meetings included daily interaction between the facilitator and individual staff members, or between the other staff members themselves (guidance counselors working with family assistants, etc.); weekly or twice weekly staff meetings set up and run by the facilitator; monthly Pupil Personnel Committee meetings; and other meetings such as after-school per-session meetings on curriculum development. Topics typically discussed included attendance monitoring and outreach procedures and problems, the types of incentives that should be used, problems encountered in working with C.B.O.s, upcoming activities in the linkages program, and the needs and problems of particular students. Staff members gave these meetings high marks because they dealt with site-specific issues, came from first-hand experience, enabled them to work together as a team to solve problems, and gave them a strong sense of support and caring.

Other Types of Training

In addition to the types of training noted above, some staff members received training from outside agencies. Training for health services personnel came primarily from the Department of Health, and included sessions on such topics as AIDS, drug abuse, family planning, and how to handle sensitive issues such as rape. H.R.C.s rated these training sessions highly because they gave them specific, concrete information which they could use in their work.

III. STUDENT OUTCOMES

DATA SOURCES

O.E.A. conducted three major data collections to obtain quantitative information about the characteristics and performance of students who participated in A.I./D.P.

- Facilitators, assisted by O.E.A. staff, completed initial student rosters in October, 1985. These rosters listed names, identification numbers, secondary eligibility criteria, and 1984-85 attendance and course data for students initially targeted for A.I./D.P. services.

- Staff updated these rosters at the end of the fall, 1985 and spring, 1986 terms. Update information included 1985-86 attendance, course, and credit data for students listed on the initial roster. Facilitators also noted whether any of the students were discharged, and provided data on students added to the program to replace those discharged.*

- The data from these sources were merged to create a computerized master data file.** Additional data elements from central files such as language status and standardized test scores were added to the master file to create the final A.I./D.P. data set used in analyses of student outcomes.

NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

A.I./D.P. staff compiled rosters of 6,027 A.I./D.P. students for the 1985-86 project year. O.E.A. examined the data for these students and eliminated three percent (171) who were discharged on or before October 31,

---

* A more detailed listing of the types of data collected and their sources appears in Appendix A.

** There is some loss of data every time two data files are matched. Since files are matched on the basis of students' names and identification numbers, any change in spelling or incorrect identification numbers on one of the files results in a non-match and removes that student from the master data file. O.E.A. attempted to reconcile non-matches using central data files to correct wrong spellings or incorrect identification numbers. Only after these attempts proved unsuccessful was a student's name removed from the master data file.

1985, prior to meaningful program involvement. Nearly one-half (83) of these students were discharged from O.S. schools, including 49 L.T.A.s who could not be located by program administrators. Thirty-nine percent (67) of the students were discharged from SOAR schools, and the remaining 12 percent (21) were discharged from strategies schools. O.E.A. staff also eliminated a few (21) students whom facilitators discharged after October 31st because they did not meet eligibility criteria. Eliminating these two groups of students, the total served population was 5,835 students. Fifty percent (2,915) of the served students participated in Project SOAR, 29 percent (1,704) in O.S., and 21 percent (1,216) in strategies schools. The number of participants from each school is summarized in Appendix B.

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS

The students served by A.I./D.P. were a needy population. According to facilitators' records, 85 percent of the students had failed at least three courses* in 1984-85, 56 percent were overage for their grade, 47 percent read at least two years below grade level, and four percent were limited English proficient.** These distributions were similar across models except that strategies schools served a slightly higher percentage of LEP students (eight percent) than did the other models.

Most (86 percent) of the students served by the program had been enrolled in a high school the previous year (holdover and transfer). The rest (14

---

* This group includes Operation Success students who failed only two courses the previous term.

** These data were obtained for most students served by A.I./D.P. The percentage of complete data by eligibility criterion was: overage, 91 percent; course failures, 89 percent; LEP, 88 percent; and reading two years below grade level, 82 percent.

percent) were incoming students from middle schools.* The two groups ranged in age from 14 to 22 (M = 16.5 years, S.D. = 1.2). On average, O. S. students were a few months older than students in the other models.

As might be expected from the program's focus, 62 percent of the participants were in the ninth grade and 34 percent were in the tenth grade. Approximately two percent of the students were eleventh graders. Twelfth graders and special education students made up the remaining two percent.

A breakdown of participants' grade by program model appears in Table 1. Although the program served ninth and tenth graders almost exclusively, Project SOAR (76 percent) was more likely than strategies (59 percent) or O.S. (37 percent) to target ninth graders. Not surprisingly given its vocational focus, O.S. served somewhat more tenth (54 percent) and eleventh (seven percent) graders than the other models. Both the SOAR and strategies programs served a small percentage of special education students.**

STUDENT ELIGIBILITY

A.I./D.P. guidelines, as stated in the Chancellor's Special Circular No. 29, stipulated that only students absent 20 or more days during the spring,

---

* The entry status of 12 percent of the 5,835 students served could not be determined on the basis of the data provided. These students were thus not included in breakdowns of holdover, transfer, and incoming students.

** Although program guidelines stated that special education students should participate in A.I./D.P. in proportion to their numbers in each borough, less than two percent of the students served were designated as special education students. According to the Division of Special Education, the percentage of special education students in high schools in each of the boroughs during 1985-86 was as follows: Basis, nine percent; Bronx, nine percent; Brooklyn, six percent; Manhattan, seven percent; Queens, six percent; and vocational, ten percent.

TABLE 1

Students Served by Model and Grade[a]

MODEL	GRADE										MODEL TOTAL	
	Ninth[b]		Tenth		Eleventh		Twelfth		Special Ed.			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SOAR	2,141	76	609	22	4	--[c]	4	--[c]	50	2	2,808	50
Strategies	638	59	412	38	9	--[c]	1	--[c]	21	2	1,081	21
Operation Success	607	37	889	54	120	7	37	2	0	0	1,653	29
GRADE TOTAL	3,386	62	1,910	34	134	2	42	--[c]	71	1	5,542	100

[a] Five percent (293) of the students were missing grade information and are thus not included in this table.

[b] This category represents the percentage of students in each model by grade.

[c] A line indicates less than one percent.

- Project SOAR (76 percent) was more likely than strategies (59 percent) or O.S. (37 percent) to target ninth graders.
- O.S. served somewhat more tenth (54 percent) and eleventh (seven percent) graders than the other models.

1985 term or 40 days during the 1984-85 school year were eligible for program services. However, the eligibility criteria for the three O.S. schools varied slightly based on an agreement between the Board of Education and FEGS. In O.S. schools, only students with 25 or more absences and two course failures in spring, 1985, or those with 10 or more absences during September and October, 1985 and in danger of dropping out of school were eligible for the program. As noted in the Introduction to this report, the O.S. criteria were changed for the spring, 1985 term.

According to O.E.A. analyses, 89 percent (2,585) of SOAR students and 88 percent (1,074) of strategies students receiving services met the attendance eligibility requirements stipulated in the Chancellor's Special Circular No. 29. O.E.A. did not collect the number of absences by month and thus could not determine whether students in O.S. schools met their eligibility criteria.

STUDENT DISCHARGES AND LATE ADMISSIONS

As expected of an at-risk population, there was mobility in the A.I./D.P. population. Of the 5,835 students served, 50 percent (2,943) were identified in September and received services throughout the 1985-86 school year (full-year students). Another 19 percent (1,090) entered the program between November 1, 1985 and January 31, 1986 and participated in A.I./D.P. for the remainder of the school year (fall late-admissions). About 22 percent (1,275) entered during the spring, 1986 term (spring-only students). The remaining nine percent (527) received services but were discharged sometime during the 1985-86 school year (discharges).

A breakdown of students' duration of service by program model is presented in Table 2. The percentage of spring-only and discharged students is

TABLE 2

Students Served by Model and Duration of Service

MODEL	DURATION OF SERVICE: Full Year N	Full Year %[a]	Fall Late Admissions N	Fall Late Admissions %	Spring Only N	Spring Only %	Discharges N	Discharges %	MODEL TOTAL N	MODEL TOTAL %
SOAR	1,454	50	599	20	568	20	294	10	2,915	50
Strategies	756	62	65	5	290	24	105	9	1,216	21
Operation Success	733	43	426	25	417	25	128	7	1,704	29
CATEGORY TOTAL	2,943	50	1,090	19	1,275	22	527	9	5,835	100

[a] Row percent indicates the percentage of students in each model.

- One-half of A.I./D.P. students participated in the program for the full-year.
- The major difference in the length of time students were served by model was in strategies schools: there were relatively more full-year and fewer fall late-admission students in strategies schools than in the other schools.

quite similar in the three program models. However, strategies schools had a substantially higher percentage (62 percent) of full-year students and a correspondingly lower percentage (five percent) of fall late-admission students than the other program models.

O.E.A. further analyzed discharges by model and month of discharge. Forty-seven percent of the discharged Project SOAR students were transfers to other schools and programs. These transfers left the school at a relatively steady rate throughout the fall term and at a lower but similarly steady rate during the spring term. Of the remaining SOAR discharges, about 27 percent left school for various kinds of personal reasons and 25 percent were L.T.A.s. All but one of the students in these latter two groups had been discharged by the end of the fall term.

In the strategies schools, 95 percent of the discharges occurred during the fall term. The largest group (36 percent) were students described as L.T.A.s. Students leaving for personal reasons (30 percent) and transfers (28 percent) made up the next largest categories; the remainder were students who obtained their diploma or G.E.D. (seven percent).

Because the O.S. program was designed to serve a large number of students on a sometimes short-term basis, facilitators and FEGS personnel continued to add and discharge students throughout the school year. Forty percent of the total discharges occurred between March and June. Since facilitators initially did not attempt to "weed out" those students with very poor attendance records, over two-fifths (43 percent) of the discharged students from O.S. were reported to be L.T.A.s; of these, about one-fourth were discharged by the end of the fall term. Transfers represented about one-third (36 percent) of the discharges from O.S., while students gaining

a G.E.D. or their high school diploma represented 10 percent, and students leaving for other reasons such as illness, pregnancy, or family problems made up the remaining 11 percent.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

Program outcomes focused on student improvement in attendance and achievement. In assessing the program's impact on these objectives, O.E.A. utilized as much 1984-85 and 1985-86 attendance and course data as possible. Thus, if a holdover or transfer student did not have complete data for both years but did have complete data for fall, 1984 and fall, 1985 or spring, 1985 and spring, 1986, the data for the corresponding terms were used in the analysis. Similarly, if an incoming student had complete data for the 1984-85 school year plus data for the fall, 1985 or spring, 1986 term, the attendance rate for the year and term were used in the analysis. Using this method, O.E.A. obtained attendance results for 78 percent and course data for 74 percent of the students served.*

Attendance

The attendance objective stipulated that 50 percent of the students provided with A.I./D.P. services would have better attendance in 1985-86 than the previous year. Overall, this objective was not met; only 39 percent

---

* The percentages of complete attendance and course data for students by duration of service were as follows: 87 percent and 78 percent for full-year students, 76 percent and 75 percent for fall late-admissions, 59 percent and 60 percent for spring-only students, and 74 percent and 31 percent for discharges, respectively. The low percentage of course data for discharged students is a function of the fact that many schools do not record course data unless the student is present at the end of the year.

(1,791) of the students improved their attendance from the previous year. However, as indicated in Table 3, the percentage of Project SOAR (47 percent) and Operation Success (48 percent) full-year students and of SOAR fall late-admission (49 percent) students improving their attendance was not significantly different statistically than the criterion of 50 percent, indicating that students in these groups essentially met the program's attendance objective.

O.E.A. further examined the attendance of students receiving A.I./D.P. services by comparing their percentage attendance during the program year against their percentage attendance during the previous year. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.* Overall, students in all three program models attended school about two-thirds (65 percent) of the time in 1984-85. However, the attendance of spring-only students (72 percent) was considerably higher than that for full-year students (63 percent). The higher rate for spring-only students suggests that these students were less needy than students placed in the program earlier in the year.

On average, A.I./D.P. students attended school about 57 percent of the time during the program year -- a decline of eight percentage points from 1984-85. Spring-only students had the largest decline in attendance (ten points), followed by fall late-admission (nine points); full-year

---

* Data for discharged students is not presented because the variability in length of services received by these students would make such an analysis meaningless.

TABLE 3

Number and Percentage of Students Improving Their 1985-86 Attendance as Compared with 1984-85 by Duration of Service and Model

MODEL	DURATION OF SERVICE: Full Year N	Full Year %	Fall Late Admissions N	Fall Late Admissions %	Spring Only N	Spring Only %	Discharges N	Discharges %	MODEL TOTAL N	MODEL TOTAL %
SOAR	587	47*	244	49*	89	24	37	17	957	41
Strategies	267	39	18	32	46	25	9	15	340	34
Operation Success	306	48*	74	27	79	39	35	30	494	40
CATEGORY TOTAL[a]	1,160	45	336	41	214	28	81	21	1,791	39

NOTE: The analysis is based on data for 4,541 students (78 percent of those served).

* According to a normal curve test of the difference between proportions, the percentage of students in these groups who met the objective is not significantly different than 50 percent, the proposed target.

[a] This category represents the overall percentage of students who improved by duration of service.

- Overall, the program's attendance objective was not met.
- Full-year students in Project SOAR and O.S. and fall-late admissions in Project SOAR essentially met the attendance objective.

TABLE 4

A Two-Year Comparison of the Average Percentage Attendance by Model and Duration of Service[a]

	DURATION OF SERVICE															
	FULL-YEAR				FALL LATE-ADMISSIONS				SPRING-ONLY				MODEL TOTAL			
MODEL	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change
SOAR	1,239	64	60	-4	497	64	62	-2	373	70	57	-18	2,109	65	60	-5
Strategies	685	67	59	-8	57	66	53	-13	184	71	60	-11	926	68	59	-9
Operation Success	644	55	50	-5	275	66	47	-19	201	78	72	-6	1,117	62	53	-9
CATEGORY TOTAL	2,568	63	57	-6	829	65	56	-9	758	72	62	-10	4,152	65	57	-8

[a] Discharges have been excluded from this analysis.

- Overall, attendance declined eight percentage points from 1984-85 to 1985-86.
- Among full-year students, who comprised the bulk of the population, the decline was six percentage points.

students' attendance declined by only six percentage points. By grade (not shown in the table), the attendance of ninth graders dropped six percentage points (from 62 to 56 percent) and the attendance of tenth-graders declined seven percentage points (from 67 to 60 percent).*

Courses Passed

The program's course objective stated that 50 percent of the students who had failed at least one subject the previous year would pass at least one more course in 1985-86. Ninety-one percent (5,289) of the participants failed at least one subject in 1984-85; of these, 3,929 (74 percent) had complete course data and were included in analyses of course outcomes.

The objective's criterion (i.e., students should pass one more course in 1985-86 than they had the previous year) does not take into account the fact that the number of subjects a student takes varies from year to year and from term to term, particularly as students make the transition from middle to high school. Accordingly, O.E.A. examined the course objective by comparing the percentage of courses passed from one year to the next. Comparing percentages accounts for both the number of courses that students passed and the number for which they were enrolled.

---

* These results by grade can be compared with the attendance rates of a group of ninth- and tenth-graders who attended school prior to the inception of the A.I./D.P. program and who had characteristics similar to A.I./D.P. students. Ninth-graders attended school about 63 percent of the time and tenth-graders attended 66 percent of the time during the first year that attendance was examined. During the following year, ninth-graders' attendance declined an average of 11 percentage points and tenth-graders' attendance declined an average of 8.5 percentage points.

As shown in Table 5, the courses-passed objective was not met overall, since only 43 percent of the students passed more courses than the previous year. However, SOAR full-year (54 percent) and fall late-admission (50 percent) students did meet this objective. Furthermore, the percentage of full-year strategies students (49 percent) and full-year students as a whole (49 percent) passing more courses in 1985-86 than the previous year was not significantly different statistically than 50 percent, indicating that these students also met the courses-passed objective.*

As with attendance, O.E.A. further examined the achievement of A.I./D.P. students by comparing the average number of courses passed during the program year with their mean achievement during the previous year. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 6. Overall, students in all three program models passed less than one-third (30 percent) of their courses in 1984-85. Interestingly, the achievement pattern by duration of service echoes that shown in the attendance analysis; that is, the achievement rate of spring-only students (47 percent) was substantially higher than the overall rate, while the achievement rate of full-year students (24 percent) was considerably lower. Both of these findings support the argument that students added to the program during the spring were less needy than those served first.

---

* Forty-seven percent of strategies fall late-admissions and 49 percent of O.S. discharges also essentially met the courses-passed objective, but the number of cases included in the analysis is too small for these outcomes to be meaningful.

TABLE 5

Number and Percentage of Students Passing More Courses in 1985-86 than in 1984-85 by Duration of Service and Model[a]

	DURATION OF MODEL									
	Full Year		Fall Late Admissions		Spring Only		Discharges		MODEL TOTAL	
MODEL	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SOAR	624	54*	232	50*	84	23	14	17	954	46
Strategies	236	49*	22	47*	46	26	6	29	310	43
Operation Success	244	40	79	29	94	35	30	49*	447	37
CATGORY TOTAL	1,104	49*	333	42	224	28	50	31	1,711	43

NOTE: The analysis is based on data for 3,929 students (74 percent of those served).

a This analysis applies only to students who failed at least one course in 1984-85. Ninety-one percent of the students in A.I./D.P. in 1985-86 met this criteria.

* According to a normal curve test of the difference between proportions, the percentage of students in these groups who met the objective is not significantly different than 50 percent.

- Overall, students did not meet the course objective.
- Both full-year students overall and fall late-admissions in SOAR and strategy schools essentially met the course objective.

TABLE 6

A Two-Year Comparison of the Average Percentage of Courses Passed by Model and Duration of Service[a]

	DURATION OF SERVICE															
	FULL-YEAR				FALL LATE-ADMISSIONS				SPRING-ONLY				MODEL TOTAL			
MODEL	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change	N	% 1984-85	% 1985-86	% Change
SOAR	1,164	28	38	10	468	24	33	9	360	48	25	-23	1,992	31	35	4
Strategies	482	26	34	8	47	28	42	14	178	43	25	-18	707	31	32	1
Operation Success	609	16	27	11	272	32	21	-11	291	47	37	-10	1,152	27	28	1
CATEGORY TOTAL	2,255	24	34	10	787	27	30	3	809	47	29	-18	3,851	30	32	2

[a] Discharges have been excluded from this analysis.

- Overall, students passed approximately 30 percent of their courses in both 1984-85 and 1985-86.
- Full-year students were most likely to improve the percentage of courses passed.

As a whole, A.I./D.P. students held their own in achievement, gaining two percentage points from 1984-85 (30 percent) to 1985-86 (32 percent). Full-year students had the largest gain (from 24 percent to 34 percent). Fall late-admission students in the SOAR (nine points) and strategies (14 points) models also showed considerable improvement.*

In contrast to these improvements in achievement, however, spring-only students had a sizable decline in achievement (18 points). Since this group also had the largest decline in attendance from the previous year, it appears that their declines in attendance and achievement were somewhat related.

In fact, the correlation between changes in attendance and changes in courses passed from 1984-85 to 1985-86 was moderate (r = .40), suggesting that these two variables are indeed related. In general, a decline in attendance was matched by a corresponding decline in the percentage of courses passed. Similarly, improvement in attendance was generally matched by improvement in courses passed.

Instructional and Supportive Services

Program guidelines stipulated that 100 (two-thirds) of the 150 students served in SOAR and strategies schools were to receive a special instructional program (full services) in addition to the supportive services provided to all A.I./D.P. students. O.E.A.'s analysis of data submitted by SOAR and strategies facilitators indicates that this guideline was closely followed,

---

* Some of this improvement is the result of the statistical phenomenon known as regression to the mean, in which students initially scoring either very high or very low on a measure move toward the mean when remeasured.

even though students entered and left these programs throughout the year. In SOAR schools, about 61 percent of the students received full services in the fall and 64 percent received full services in the spring. In strategies schools, the percentages were slightly higher, with 74 percent of the students receiving full services in the fall and 68 percent receiving full services in the spring.

Although the guideline of providing full services to 100 A.I./D.P. students also applied to O.S. schools, ambiguities in the way the guideline was presented in Special Circular No. 29 caused O.S. facilitators to interpret it differently. Two of the facilitators interpreted it to mean that 100 of the students participating in O.S. were also to be placed in special academic classes, while one facilitator interpreted it to mean that 100 of the A.I./D.P. students were to receive skills training or an educational internship, and provided information regarding full service students on this basis. Another difference affecting O.S. facilitator's reporting of full and supportive services was that O.S. schools were serving many more A.I./D.P. students than the schools using the other two program models, resulting in different percentages of students receiving full and supportive services. O.S. facilitators reported that 48 percent (341) of their A.I./D.P. students received full services in the fall, and 44 percent (387) received full services in the spring.*

Even though the types of instructional services provided to A.I./D.P. students varied slightly from program to program, those students receiving

---

* O.E.A. asked program facilitators to provide both full service and supportive services data on their roster forms. Fifty-four percent of the full services columns and 64 percent of the supportive services columns on these forms contained data.

an additional instructional component performed better than students who received supportive services only. Overall, approximately 46 percent of the students receiving full services in the fall had better attendance in 1985-86 than during the previous year, as compared to about 40 percent of the students receiving supportive services only. Similarly, 45 percent of the students receiving full services in the spring improved their attendance, compared to 38 percent of the supportive services only students.

The differences between the full services and supportive services only groups is more pronounced when achievement is examined. In this case, 55 percent of the students receiving full services in the fall passed more courses in 1985-86 than they did in 1984-85, as compared to 34 percent of the students receiving supportive services only. These ratios were almost the same for the spring term (52 percent and 33 percent, respectively). These results strongly suggest that a special instructional component had a strong positive impact on the achievement of A.I./D.P. students.

Credits Earned

The program's credit objective stated that 50 percent of participants would earn sufficient credits to advance to the next highest grade. This objective proved difficult to measure. Although most schools required 40 credits to graduate,* schools varied in the number of credits they required for promotion. While one-half of the A.I./D.P. schools required that ninth grade students amass 10 credits to be promoted to tenth grade, the number

---

* The only exceptions to the 40 credit requirement among A.I./D.P. schools were Eli Whitney, which required 42 credits, and Boys and Girls and Morris, both of which required 47 credits for graduation.

ranged from six credits at Lafayette to 12 at Boys and Girls. To further complicate matters, these numbers represent the minimum number of credits needed to be promoted to the tenth grade. Depending upon their course of study, students could earn from two to six credits above the minimum. Because of the flexibility in the accumulation of credits, schools describe the number of credits necessary for promotion from grade to grade cumulatively. For example, one-half of the schools require that students amass 20 credits to be promoted to the eleventh grade and 30 credits to be promoted to the twelfth grade.

Given these complexities, O.E.A. limited its evaluation of the credit objective to the ninth-grade sample, for whom the relationship between course credit and promotion could be reliably established. Since ninth-graders comprised the bulk (62 percent) of the served population, narrowing the focus of the analysis did not substantially reduce the validity of the evaluation. The results of this analysis showed that 14 percent (246) of the Project SOAR ninth-graders, 14 percent (52) of the strategies ninth-graders, and seven percent (35) of the O.S. ninth-graders with credit data earned enough credits to be promoted to the tenth grade in 1985-86. Clearly, the credit objective was not met for ninth-graders.

The percentage of students earning credits is presented by grade in Table 7. According to the data presented in Table 7, 47 percent of the ninth-graders did not earn a single credit in 1985-86. Only 16 percent of the students earned nine or more credits and might be expected to be promoted to the next grade. This pattern is similar across all grades.

One of the problems with the program's credit objectives lies in the characteristics of the students being served by A.I./D.P. Because many of

TABLE 7

The Percentage of Students Earning Credits in 1985-86 by Grade[a]

	Credits Earned						
GRADE	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	9-10	11+
Ninth	50%	13%	9%	7%	6%	10%	4%
Tenth	42	13	10	10	8	10	8
Eleventh	43	17	14	5	9	6	6
Twelfth	38	5	5	11	16	16	8
Sp. Ed.	44	17	8	13	6	8	2
TOTAL	47	13	10	8	7	10	6

[a] This analysis is based on data for 4,313 students.

- Nearly one-half (47 percent) of the students did not earn a single credit in 1985-86.

these students were deficient in basic skills, they were also receiving remediation in Chapter I-funded classes.* Since these classes are supplementary and non-credit bearing, an A.I./D.P. student could be progressing in a remedial reading or mathematics class without earning any credits for participation in the class. This problem will be compounded if a student is programmed for both Chapter I-funded language arts (reading and writing) and math classes. The more remedial classes that students need, the fewer opportunities they have to earn credits, thus limiting their chances of being promoted. Although overall, students increased the percentage of courses passed, it had little impact on the number of credits they earned toward graduation. Indeed, course credit data indicate that the target population continues to show slow progress toward achieving a diploma.

Student Retention

The fourth A.I./D.P. objective stipulated that, starting with 1985-86 as a baseline, a minimum of 50 percent of the students in ninth grade and below provided with A.I./D.P. services would still be in school three years later. This objective will be assessed in future evaluation reports.

---

* Chapter I eligibility is determined on the basis of a complex formula that uses the proportion of a school's students who either qualified for the free lunch program or were members of families eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (A.F.D.C.).

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

All six program components were fully implemented at each A.I./D.P. site early in the fall, 1985 term. More than 90 percent of the SOAR and strategies schools served the mandated number of students (150) during the course of the year, and many served substantially more than that number. All three O.S. sites served at least 20 percent more students than specified in their contract. Eighty-eight percent of the students receiving A.I./D.P. services met the program's attendance eligibility criteria.

Although A.I./D.P. program objectives were not met by A.I./D.P. students as a whole, attendance and courses-passed objectives were met by certain categories of students. The reasons for the success of these students and the failure of other students to meet program objectives must be sought in several areas, including the program models in which component services were delivered, the characteristics of the students being served, the length of time during which students received these services, program context, and the nature of the objectives themselves.

Although all three models provided the services spelled out in Chancellor's Special Circular No. 29, they delivered these services -- particularly academic services -- in slightly different ways. In the SOAR model, virtually no distinction was made between alternative and required educational services. Instead, these two elements were folded together in a highly structured blocked program for small groups of full service A.I./D.P. students -- students who were primarily ninth-graders and whose mean attendance and achievement rates the previous year or

term indicated that they had a good chance of success in such a program. These students also received a daily tutorial period, intensive guidance and counseling services, and attendance outreach services, with the result that both full-year and fall late-admission students met the courses-passed and attendance objectives. These two groups of SOAR students were the only A.I./D.P. students to meet both objectives.

Like Project SOAR, the O.S. model was in operation in the schools prior to the 1985-86 school year. The program was designed to provide a wide range of work-readiness services to large numbers of students.

The structure of O.S. provided some problems in the context of A.I./D.P. in that FEGS services were essentially superimposed on some of the services provided by school A.I./D.P. personnel. This was particularly problematic in the area of instructional services, where there was some confusion over what constituted full services. This confusion -- plus the fact that many O.S. students were very weak academically -- may have contributed to the failure of O.S. students to meet the A.I./D.P. achievement criteria. However, full-year O.S. students did meet the A.I./D.P. attendance objective. Factors contributing to this success included the attendance outreach efforts made by both school A.I./D.P. and FEGS personnel, the extra attention and guidance support provided by FEGS on-site staff members, and students' increased motivation to attend school resulting from the vocational opportunities provided by the O.S. program.

D.H.S. added the strategies model to the A.I./D.P. program in order to give schools the opportunity to design a program that was tailored to the needs of their A.I./D.P. students and the resources available at the school. Despite this flexibility, all of the schools selected essentially the same program options, including block programming and career education/work study programs. Some of these schools selected the strategies model primarily because they wished to have career education services provided by a particular C.B.O. Students served by the strategies program fell about midway between those served by SOAR and O.S., both in terms of age and in terms of mean attendance and achievement rates the previous year.

Full-year strategies students met the courses-passed objective but not the attendance objective. Their failure to meet the latter objective may be a function of the fact that strategies programs were more loosely structured than SOAR programs, and also lacked the additional outreach capabilities of O.S. schools. One possible solution is to increase the number of attendance personnel working with A.I./D.P. students in strategies schools. However, the flexible nature of this particular program model also suggests that future evaluations should be done on a case-by-case basis to determine those elements most affecting students' attendance and achievement in each strategies school.

In addition to the programmatic reasons indicated above, other factors may have affected the ability of A.I./D.P. students to meet program objectives. On factor was the characteristics of students added to the program to replace those who were discharged, or to meet O.S.

service requirements. In most cases, the 1984-85 mean attendance and achievement rates of students added to the program later in the year were considerably higher than the rates of students initially targeted for program services. While this indicates that program facilitators selected the neediest students first, it does not explain why students added later in the year did not meet program objectives. Spring-only students, whose attendance and achievement declined markedly during the period of program service, are a particularly puzzling group. The characteristics of these students should be given close attention in future evaluations.

Another possible factor affecting students' ability to meet program objectives was the nature of the objectives themselves. As discussed previously, the promotional criterion should be adjusted to take into account the credit-granting practices of different schools, and the fact that A.I./D.P. students frequently are taking remedial classes that are not credit-bearing. For example, program planners may wish to set a criterion that can be adjusted for the situation at each particular school and also allows for the difficulty that remedial students face in gaining enough credits to be promoted.

Program planners should also give consideration to broadening the eligibility criteria of the models to give schools more flexibility in selecting students to receive program services. A step in this direction was taken when O.S. eligibility criteria were adjusted during the year to allow school administrators to select students who did not meet the absence criteria but would benefit from program participation. This

flexibility should be made available to SOAR and strategies schools as well. Consideration should also be given to providing supportive services to students who participated in the program for at least one term but no longer meet eligibility criteria.

Finally, some consideration should be given to the role and function of the school-level linkages and health services components of the A.I./D.P. program. While the linkages component provides valuable services to middle school students who may be entering the A.I./D.P. program in subsequent years, and the health services component provides essential health services to all students in the high school, they have little or no measurable impact on the performance of A.I./D.P. high school students. One possible strategy is to begin maintaining data on high school A.I./D.P. students who participated in the linkages program as middle school students to determine whether this participation had an impact on their attendance or achievement. In the case of the health services component, A.I./D.P. schools could be required to document the services received by A.I./D.P. students to determine whether these services affected their performance.

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the following specific recommendations are made:

- Alternative instructional services should be provided to all A.I./D.P.-served students.
- Program administrators should consider modifying program eligibility criteria so that students with lower absence rates can be served or so that schools have more discretion in selecting the students that they serve in the A.I./D.P. program.

- The program's promotional objectives should be adjusted to allow for variations in promotional standards in individual schools and for the lack of credits granted in remedial programs.

- The program should provide transitional guidance and attendance services to students who are no longer eligible for A.I./D.P. services.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

O.E.A.'s assessment of A.I./D.P. student outcomes required a complex data collection and analysis process. Three major data collections were conducted at the 26 schools during 1985-86: one in October, 1985, one in February, 1986, and one in June, 1986. Information from each of these data collections was keypunched onto computer tapes that were matched with several other computerized sources of student information. These tapes were merged into a single final tape containing all of the available information on each of the A.I./D.P. participants during the 1985-86 school year.

CREATION OF THE INITIAL ROSTER OF A.I./D.P. STUDENTS: OCTOBER, 1985

The initial source of this database was a centrally-prepared roster form filled out by A.I./D.P. facilitators, which elicited the following information for each student enrolled in the program during the first two months of the school year.

- Biographical data including name, student identification number, sex, birthdate, and grade.
- For incoming students, days present and absent and courses passed and failed during the 1984-85 school year. (This took into account the fact that middle school records are kept on an annual basis rather than by term.)
- For holdover and transfer students, attendance and course data as noted above, but separately for the fall, 1984 and spring, 1985 term rather than on an annual basis.
- Secondary eligibility categories; that is, whether the school identified the students as LEP, overage, reading two or more years below grade level, or having failed three courses the previous year.

This initial roster file was then matched to the fall, 1985 centrally-maintained Biofile to supplement and correct the information provided by the A.I./D.P. facilitators. The initial roster file was also matched to a tape containing students' scores on the spring, 1985 citywide reading test. These three steps resulted in the creation of a master file of all students identified by facilitators as participating in the A.I./D.P. program by the end of the second month of the fall, 1985 term.

UPDATE OF THE INITIAL FALL ROSTER: FEBRUARY, 1986

Students on Initial Rosters

The master file of initial program participants was updated at the end of the fall term. The process began when O.E.A. provided program facilitators with a computerized roster of fall students on which each student's name and I.D. number was preprinted. Facilitators at all A.I./D.P. schools indicated whether the student was receiving full services or supportive services only, whether and when the student had been discharged, and the reason for the discharge (ineligible for the program, transferred to another school or program, L.T.A., graduated from high school or passed the G.E.D., or "other"). Facilitators at schools not served by the University Applications Processing Center (U.A.P.C.) also entered the number of days present and absent and the number of courses passed and failed durng the fall term; facilitators at U.A.P.C.-served schools did not have to provide these data because they were furnished independently by U.A.P.C. The master file of all participants was then matched to this fall update file and to a U.A.P.C. tape containing fall attendance and course data for students at U.A.P.C.-served schools to create a new master file.

Fall Late Admission Students

O.E.A. also provided facilitators with roster forms for those students added to the program between the initial fall data collection (November 1) and the end of the fall term (January 31). For each of these fall late admission students, facilitators provided biographical data, secondary eligibility categories, category of services received (full or supportive only), and discharge data and reason. Facilitators at non-U.A.P.C. schools also provided 1984-85 school year and fall, 1985 attendance and course data. This file was merged with the file containing updated fall information to produce a tape containing complete fall participation data.

UPDATE OF MASTER FILE WITH SPRING PARTICIPATION DATA: JUNE, 1986

Fall, 1985 Participants

O.E.A. provided program facilitators with a computerized roster of fall participants on which each student's name and I.D. number was preprinted. Facilitators at all schools provided information on whether and when students received full or supportive services and whether, when, and why they were discharged. At non-U.A.P.C. schools, they also provided spring attendance, course, and credit information; for U.A.P.C. schools, this information was obtained centrally. This spring roster data was then added to the file containing fall participation data.

Spring-Only Students

O.E.A. also provided facilitators with roster forms for students added to A.I./D.P. during the spring term. At all schools, facilitators provided biographical data, date of entry, secondary eligibility categories, whether they were receiving full or supportive services, and 1984-85 attendance and course information. At non-U.A.P.C. schools, facilitators also provided

1985-86 attendance, course, and credit information; for U.A.P.C. schools, this information was obtained centrally.

The file created from these data was then matched to the fall, 1985 Biofile to supplement and correct the information provided by A.I./D.P. facilitators; to the spring, 1986 Bilingual Education Student Information System (BESIS) file to verify or correct information on whether participants were of limited English proficiency; to fall, 1985 and spring, 1986 citywide reading and math test score tapes; and to winter, 1986 and spring, 1986 reading and math Regents Competency Test score tapes. The resulting file was then merged with the previously created master file to create the final tape containing all available information on each of the A.I./D.P. participants during the 1985-86 school year.

APPENDIX B

School by School Summary of Students Served and Those With Complete Attendance and Course Data[a]

	STUDENTS IN PROGRAM		STUDENTS WITH COMPLETE DATA			
			ATTENDANCE		COURSES PASSED	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
SOAR	**2,915**	**49.9**	**2,324**		**2,111**	72.0
Boys and Girls**	182	3.1	120	65.9	123	67.6
Bronx Regional*	80	1.4	52	65.0	52	65.0
Curtis	169	2.9	163	96.4	153	90.5
Eli Whitney**	172	2.9	63	36.7	84	48.9
Evander Childs*	199	3.4	150	75.3	129	64.8
Franklin K. Lane	135	2.3	130	96.2	118	87.4
G. Washington*	247	4.2	202	81.8	127	51.4
G. Wingate	161	2.8	137	85.1	123	76.4
James Monroe**	187	3.2	166	88.8	140	74.9
John F. Kennedy	214	3.7	191	89.3	165	77.1
Martin L. King	199	3.4	177	88.9	163	81.9
Park West	135	2.3	116	85.9	121	89.6
Sarah J. Hale	204	3.5	186	91.2	167	81.9
Walton	219	3.8	196	89.5	179	81.7
W. Irving	205	3.5	182	88.8	150	73.2
W. Bryant*	207	3.5	93	44.9	117	56.5
STRATEGIES	**1,216**	**20.8**	**985**		**747**	61.0
A. Stevenson	193	3.3	180	93.3	152	78.7
A. Jackson	182	3.1	167	91.7	156	85.7
C. Columbus**	204	3.5	133	65.2	154	75.5
J. Richman	205	3.5	165	80.5	146	71.2
Lower E. Side Prep	54	0.9	26	48.1	31	57.4
Morris	179	3.1	167	93.3	0[b]	0.0[b]
Seward Park**	199	3.4	147	73.9	108	54.3
OPERATION SUCCESS	**1,704**	**29.2**	**1,232**		**1,182**	69.0
DeWitt Clinton**	633	10.8	337	53.2	367	58.0
Erasmus Hall**	649	11.1	542	83.5	507	78.1
Lafayette	422	7.2	353	83.6	308	73.0

[a] These numbers represent all students for whom there were data, regardless of their length of participation in the program.

[b] Course data were inadvertently not collected from Morris. It was on the U.A.P.C. system for attendance information but not for course data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) indicates that the SOAR component was in the school the previous year. Two asterisks (**) indicate that O.S. was in the school the previous year.

APPENDIX C

School By School Summary of Attendance and Course Improvement[a]

MODEL	ATTENDANCE		COURSES PASSED	
	N	% IMPROVE-MENT	N	% IMPROVE-MENT
SOAR	957	41.0	954	45.0
Boys and Girls	59	49.2	64	51.6
Bronx Regional*	29	55.8	33	61.1
Curtis	73	44.8	75	48.7
Eli Whitney	32	50.8	37	44.6
Evander Childs*	69	46.0	70	53.8
Franklin K. Lane	84	64.6	67	55.8
George Washington*	47	23.3	57	44.9
George Wingate	65	47.4	70	56.9
James Monroe	63	38.0	55	40.1
John F. Kennedy	93	48.7	70	43.2
Martin L. King	56	31.6	62	39.5
Park West	41	35.3	53	43.8
Sarah J. Hale	78	41.9	73	50.3
Walton	64	32.7	48	28.6
Washington Irving	82	45.1	67	45.0
W. Bryant*	22	23.7	53	44.5
STRATEGIES	340	34.0	310	41.0
Adlai Stevenson	59	32.8	89	58.9
A. Jackson	64	38.3	68	44.7
C. Columbus	50	37.6	68	45.6
Julia Richman	43	26.1	47	33.1
Lower E. Side	16	61.5	14	46.7
Morris	53	31.7	0[b]	0[b]
Seward Park	55	37.4	24	23.1
OPERATION SUCCESS	494	40.0	447	36.0
DeWitt Clinton	143	42.4	80	19.2
Erasmus Hall*	248	45.8	273	54.5
Lafayette	103	29.2	94	31.8

a Data for all service categories are included in this analysis.

b Course data were inadventently not collected for Morris. This school uses the U.A.P.C. system for attendance but not for course data.